DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 202 SP 037 710

AUTHOR	Thiessen, Dennis, Ed.; Howey, Kenneth R., Ed.
TITLE	Agents, Provocateurs: Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-89333-154-6
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	185p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AACTE Publications, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 (AACTE members $30; nonmembers $35, plus $5 shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Deans; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers addresses two issues of critical importance to higher education: leadership and changing the way that schools and colleges of education conduct the business of teaching and learning. The book contains an introductory paper, seven studies written from the perspective of the deans leading the change, and a concluding paper. Six of the seven institutions included in the volume are public. The institutions vary in size and historic commitment to teacher preparation. After a foreword by Eileen Wilson Oyelaran, the nine papers are: "The Context for Leadership and Reform in Schools and Colleges of Education" (Kenneth R. Howey); "Leadership for Change in Faculties of Education" (Michael Fullan); "The New Sisyphus: The Dean as Change Agent" (Richard Wisniewski); "Deaning in the Nineties: The Challenge of Restructuring a Professional College" (Nancy L. Zimpher); "New Values and New Programs: One Dean's Experience" (Raphael O. Nystrand); "Reconstructing the Community of the School of Education: Influencing Habits of Mind, Discourse, Work, and Results" (Gail Huffman-Joley); "Addressing the Dean's Dilemma" (Sam J. Yarger); "Building Capacity for Change" (Richard Arends); and "Deans of Education: Only the Reform-Minded Need Apply" (Dennis Thiessen). (Most papers contain references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AGENTS, PROVOCATEURS:

ED 415 202

Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education

Edited by Dennis Thiessen & Kenneth R. Howey

S103470

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

ACADEMY for LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AGENTS, PROVOCATEURS:

Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education

Edited by Dennis Thiessen & Kenneth R. Howey

3

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking, policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of *Agents, Provocateurs: Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education* may be ordered from:

AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
WWW: www.aacte.org

Single copy for AACTE members: $30
For nonmembers: $35
Please add $5 for shipping and handling.

Copyright © 1998 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-154-6

Contents

Foreword 5
Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran

The Context for Leadership and Reform in Schools & Colleges of Education 9
Kenneth R. Howey

Leadership for Change in Faculties of Education 29
Michael Fullan

The New Sisyphus: The Dean as Change Agent 49
Richard Wisniewski

Deaning in the Nineties: The Challenge of Restructuring a Professional College 59
Nancy L. Zimpher

New Values & New Programs: One Dean's Experience 77
Raphael O. Nystrand

Reconstructing the Community of the School of Education: Influencing Habits of Mind, Discourse, Work, & Results 97
Gail Huffman-Joley

Addressing the Deans' Dilemma 127
Sam J. Yarger

Building Capacity for Change 143
Richard Arends

Deans of Education: Only the Reform-Minded Need Apply 167
Dennis Thiessen

About the Authors 187

Foreword

Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran

Agents, Provocateurs: Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education addresses two issues of critical importance to higher education: leadership and what Michael Fullan and his colleagues call "reculturing"—changing the way in which schools and colleges of education conduct the business of teaching and learning. The book contains seven case studies of educational reform and decanal leadership written from the perspective of the deans leading the change. Each of the contributors is a well-respected leader in the field of educational reform and, in addition, had participated in the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE) for several years. The case studies are introduced and concluded by two theoretical chapters written by the coeditors, Kenneth Howey (Ohio State University) and Dennis Thiessen (University of Toronto). In the introductory chapter, Howey carefully delineates the environment in which higher education reform occurs and examines the appropriateness of fit between the literature on leadership and the higher education context. In the final chapter, Thiessen identifies distinctive aspects related to leading change in higher education.

This volume comes at a most opportune time. Higher education, both public and private, is the target of criticism by governing boards and the public, both of whom question the quality of education undergraduates receive, the appropriateness of the emphasis on research and graduate education, the impact of higher education on critical community problems, and escalating costs. Within the higher education community at large, schools and colleges of education have received a significant portion of this opprobrium as evidenced by the outcry regarding the preparation of preservice educators and nature of the interaction between K–12 schools and colleges of education. In this context, a volume that examines the activity of leaders as they attempt to effect major change in the culture and praxis of schools of education represents a major contribution to the literature.

The book should constitute instructive reading for all students of leadership and change in higher education; however, it has particular salience for those interested in the simultaneous reform of schools of

education and K-12 schools: deans, education faculty, public school educators, and administrators. The case studies provide useful and specific descriptions of the innovations implemented at each institution. The diversity of innovations reminds the reader that exemplary practices take many forms and that context heavily influences what is most appropriate. The variety of the programs described should also serve as a catalyst for those in search of ideas and pathways for the transformation of schools into environments where learning and teaching are more effective and satisfying.

The volume's unique contribution, however, does not emanate from considerations of the content of changes described. Rather, the volume's uniqueness is derived from the perspective taken by the authors. Each dean examines, subjectively and, in most cases, in the first person, his or her role in the process of leading change. At its heart, this is a book about leadership, written by educational leaders who have studied leadership theory and organizational behavior, who have successfully facilitated educational reform and reculturing, and who have, in this volume, stepped back to analyze their role and to distill the lessons learned from their praxis.

The volume is strengthened by the diversity of contexts represented in the chapters. Although six of the seven institutions included in the volume are public, they vary in size and in historic commitment to the preparation of teachers. Furthermore, the processes of leading change that are being described occur at very different points in the careers of the authors. Several of the deans led change efforts on campuses where they had served as deans for many years. Others describe changes they began after arriving on a new campus in the initial year of their first deanship. Others were experienced administrators who began their second deanship with a clearly articulated change agenda.

In spite of these contextual variations considerable uniformity of ideas emerges as the each of the writers reflects upon his or her experience. If anything, this congruence of thought adds greater power to the ideas that have emerged as this group of educational leaders considers the role of the dean in leading educational reform and reculturing. Although each writer has a slightly different nuance, throughout the volume the reader is cautioned that change takes time and patience. Most of the contributors also concur that a wise leader initiates a vision and a process, and once the process is underway backs off to let it take its course. There is much to be garnered from the experience of these leaders. Without a doubt, the reader would like to know more about the manner in which the deans

confronted the inevitable failures and setbacks incumbent in the process of leading change. How within the context of educational reform did they explicitly address the challenges of cultural diversity, urban education and gender equity, issues which Richard Wisniewski reminds us academe is reluctant to address.

Without a doubt the relevance of the volume is hardly limited to schools of education. Anyone interested in or engaged in leading change in higher education, whether the context is a small liberal arts college or a major research university, has much to learn form this book. At a time when higher education requires models for team leadership, capacity building and the enhancement of community, the *Agents, Provocateurs: Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education* represents a significant contribution to the literature. Kenneth Howey notes in his introductory chapter, "First-person examination of one's own leadership in challenging higher education contexts is only emerging in the literature. This book is a start in this direction. ...(p 25)" I, for one, hope that this genre of leadership study will continue and that as it expands we will see reflections from more diverse higher education contexts: small as well as large institutions, historically black as well as historically white. Warren Bennis and Burt Nauns in *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge* tell us, "it's not easy ... learning how to lead....it's sort of like learning to play the violin in public." By making the harmony and the discord of their playing highly visible, the contributors have enabled others to think more deeply about leading change.

The Context for Leadership & the Reform of Teacher Education in Schools & Colleges of Education

Kenneth R. Howey

In this chapter, I review the current context and pressures for reform in schools and colleges of education within the larger university context, and the pressures for the reform of teacher preparation itself. The deans who contributed the following chapters were a part of the Urban Network To Improve Teacher Education (UNITE) and in this reform initiative they came together periodically and reflected on their actions as academic leaders in these innovative endeavors. Thus, the chapter concludes by reviewing common propositions regarding leadership and change which these deans shared during the UNITE leadership development sessions. Their observations, just as prevalent conditions in higher education generally and pressure for improved teacher education, provide context for interpreting the ensuing chapters.

Professional Schools of Education in a Changing University Context

What challenges are schools and colleges of education, and deans particularly, facing as they interact in the broader university context? Among these challenges are the rising costs of a college education and the concomitant pressure for a quality education for students that justifies the considerable investment made by students and parents. These rising costs, in turn, drive continuing forms of downsizing and restructuring across universities. There is also increased emphasis on generating external support from contracts and grants and from development campaigns which enlist the support of individual and corporate donors. Other challenges include the need to keep up with, if not inform, the rapid changes in modern computing and communications technology which can mediate student learning in powerful ways. Universities and colleges are now populated by students who have grown up in an electronic world.

This is not the only challenge presented by today's students. Many college students have not acquired appropriate study and learning skills and often do not have the prerequisite knowledge to succeed in certain

core subjects. The academy has also changed in terms of its views of what constitutes knowledge and knowing. Sharp differences exist about what knowledge is of the most worth and how that is determined and how students should be engaged in acquiring these understandings. Thus students find themselves in the throes of culture 'wars' with little explanation provided about polarized positions they encounter and how they might be bridged.

Recently the Kellogg Foundation commissioned a group of distinguished higher education leaders to chart new directions for state and land-grant universities. Their joint statement further speaks to the challenges of higher education faculty and administrators:

> Today, it is no secret that our colleges and universities are now beset by an array of problems, new to most of us: chronic shortages of funds, coupled with increasing costs and tuition and public resistance to higher taxes; new skepticism from members of the "attentive public" about our productivity, accompanied by hard questions about research and tenure; an academic culture that appears to measure excellence by scholarly citations and the number of doctoral candidates, not minds opened or the needs of undergraduates; vigorous new competitors in the academic market, ready and eager to provide services we have ignored; and a sharp conflict among faculty, administrators, and other leaders about which of these problems need immediate attention and how to address them (1996).

Rising Costs & Demands for Accountability

Many of the criticisms previously leveled at K-12 education are now planted firmly at the doorstep of higher education. A common perception about the state of many elementary and secondary schools is now prevalent as well in the postsecondary sector: on the one hand the cost of a college education continues to rise while on the other the quality of education is seen as diminishing. The continuing concern about the quality of beginning teachers, for example, is a criticism attached to college graduates in general, whatever vocation they pursue. The cost of a college education, especially in the private sector, is simply priced out of the reach of many. For example, in 1980, a Pell Grant covered 38 percent of the average cost of a private four-year university. Today it covers only 14 percent. The Clinton administration has recently attempted to broaden access to a college education by increasing the number of Pell Grants.

A good example of the negative effects of the rising costs of a college education can be seen in the results of the 1990 Research About Teacher

Education (RATE) study which polled prospective teachers about their choice of a college or university to pursue a teaching degree. These prospective teachers reported that the cost of that education and proximity to home (the latter also being a cost factor) were the overriding considerations in their choices of where to enroll in a teacher education program. Since there is a high correlation in urban pockets of poverty with race, these rising costs are also a factor in explaining the underrepresentation of individuals from minority populations in teacher education programs.

Who is attending college today? Mathews (1996) reports in *Bright College Years: Inside the American Campus Today* that only 1 in 5 students fit the stereotype of a student younger than 22, enrolled full time, and continuously and living on campus. Rather, today's college student population is increasingly female, older, local (4 in 5 enroll in a public institution in their state) and in debt. Mathews further reports that at present $26 billion has been allocated in student loans and half of all students graduate with significant debts. (p. 31)

In an attempt to address the challenges associated with these rising costs, major cost-saving or cost-cutting changes are occurring across universities—"downsizing," "rightsizing," and restructuring are pervasive all-university activities. Funds from academic units such as colleges and departments are redirected back to central administration and then redistributed to other academic units on comparative criteria concerned with quality. A common decision rule for determining which academic units will receive reallocated funds is the pattern and level of extramural funds which they have generated. Thus, from this perspective, the age-old principle of the rich getting richer is commonly reinforced in these "restructuring" endeavors since schools of education have always struggled in regard to funds available for research and development. A few statistics vividly illustrate this. The National Science Foundation (1995) recently reported that from 1987 through fiscal year 1994, U.S. universities and colleges increased the amount of money they spent on research and development in the sciences and engineering by about 74 percent. The big winner was the medical sciences which increased 88 percent during that period to a level of approximately $5.6 billion. The amount of funds allocated for the humanities and social sciences during this time was microscopic by comparison and is still diminishing. For example, The National Endowment for the Humanities, the biggest funding source for support of the humanities in the United States, was cut 36 percent in 1996 alone to approximately $110 million. The support for postsecondary-level teacher education, however, is even more minuscule

and a large percentage of the relatively small amount of research funds in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement is now increasingly targeted for the elementary and secondary education sector.

As a result, it is now not uncommon for schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) in major universities to have their own development officer and development campaigns. This fund-raising, however, is strategically set within the larger and increasingly ambitious development campaign of the university which commonly dictates just who can approach which potential donors. For every major gift to a school or college of education, one will find several other 'gifts' targeted for such areas as athletic facilities, the medical complex and the business school. In this new era of support for higher education, the playing field across academic units is far from level.

Technology & Learning to Learn

There are other challenges as well in the larger university context which have an impact on schools of education particularly. Computers and other forms of modern telecommunications are pervasive in our larger society and raise issues about what courses can and should be offered by what means to what students in what locations. While it is still common practice for interaction to occur in the conventional campus classroom, one increasingly finds students who have grown up interacting with electronics rather than books and images rather than words. I commend that the level of support for technological tools and facilities, such as 'smart classrooms' in our schools and colleges of education, does not compare favorably with other facilities and laboratories across our universities. It is reasonable to expect that changes in pedagogical practice would be a focal point in a college of education—especially as enhanced by modern communications technology—but universities and surely schools and colleges of education have simply not kept pace with changes in the larger society.

The Competition for Able Students

While college attendance has ballooned since the end of World War II, college student achievement still remains unacceptably low in many instances. Today it is estimated that there are over 9 million students attending college full time in the over 2,100 four-year institutions of higher education, with several million more students enrolled part-time. Competition for students across colleges (and universities) is fierce and standards uneven, and in some cases alarmingly low. Beyond this, it is not

uncommon for students with B averages and above in high school to have to enroll in remedial coursework to bring their reading, writing, and mathematical abilities up to a level so that they can succeed in post secondary level study. While this is especially true of students who attend schools in areas enmeshed in poverty, it is by no means restricted to these students. Beyond this, there are still staggering gaps in both college attendance and college completion between White and Black and White and Latino students. Our larger universities and our schools of education by no means reflect the proportion of minority populations in our country.

Polarization of Faculty Perspectives & the Cafeteria Curriculum

Nonetheless, the landscape of universities has changed and in many ways dramatically in recent years. For example, higher education is marked by unprecedented conflicts over how our culture is legitimately represented in the curriculum. The nature of knowledge and how one comes to understand has become an increasingly divisive topic in the academy. The inherent conflict between the university's role in preserving and transmitting our traditions on the one hand and in producing new knowledge and understandings on the other has been honed to a sharp edge. Debates are pervasive about how race, gender, and ethnicity define our culture and one's position in this regard can influence both the nature of the curriculum and student engagement with it in dramatically different ways.

The academy which should provide a safe harbor for dialogue and debate around these differences too often beaches itself on strident assertions about who's right and one's rights. As a result, today's college students often experience a sharp contrast in beliefs and values, philosophies and pedagogical practice among their professors. Differences and diversity can and should be springboards to learning but it can only happen when there is an effort to explain or bridge these differences for students. In writing about these "culture wars," Graff (1992) laments the pluralistic "cafeteria counter" curriculum in today's higher education institutions which leaves it up to students to make connections or understand the differences which faculty don't address with them. Rather than capitalizing on our diversity, cliques of faculty, program areas, and even departments tend to immunize themselves from one another with their ideological differences. They often clash in faculty forums rather than in dialogue with one another and with their students in instructional settings where they could examine their differences in a civilized manner.

Graff (1992) reflects on how the very insularity of his own department and professional contacts constrained his ability to write about the positive potential of these controversies and how this polarizing condition is really the condition of our broader society:

> So the problems I have had in writing this book turn out to be intimately connected with the problems the book is about—namely, the communicative disorders of a society that is becoming so shell-shocked by cultural conflict and disagreement that it would rather escape from the battle than confront it and try to work things out. For finally, the habit of preaching to the already converted is not restricted to the academy. A dangerous inability to talk to one another is the price we pay for a culture that makes it easy for us to avoid having to respect and deal with the people who strongly disagree with us. Like the American university, a good deal of American life is organized so as to protect us from having to confront those unpleasant adversaries who may be just the ones we need to listen to. (viii)

This *academic insularity* is not lost on the general public. The Kellogg Commission leaders sound a solemn warning:

> To state the case as succinctly as possible: We are convinced that unless our institutions respond to the challenges and opportunities before them, they risk being consigned to a sort of academic Jurassic Park—places of great historic interest, fascinating to visit, but increasingly irrelevant in a world that has passed them by. (p.1)

This divisiveness can be found as well in SCDEs where there are faculty members who are not only harsh in their critique of public schools but contemptuous as well of colleagues who spend much time there. K-12 practitioners with whom I work are rightly suspicious of institutions and individuals who criticize them from a distance yet do not offer to help redress the problems they point out. Unfortunately, however, not many of these critics demonstrate any penchant to examine and address the shortcomings within their own SCDEs. A very real chasm remains between those who engage in sustained work in schools, especially the partner and professional development schools, and those who invest their energies in the more orthodox and traditional activities of the university. These differences represent both unnecessary dichotomies between theory and practice and what constitutes scholarly activity but an unfortunate stratification as well among faculty within schools, colleges, and depart-

ments of education with a research mission. This discord around what counts as scholarly activity surely extends to faculty members within the larger university in many instances and these tensions are heightened since many schools and colleges of education are attempting to redefine themselves as professional schools by establishing new roles and strengthened relationships and engaging in new forms of scholarships with practicing professionals in K-12 schools.

To understand the pressures on and challenges facing schools, colleges, and departments of education, it is necessary to understand the university context in which many SCDEs are located. Restructuring and reorganization are all-university initiatives and are driven largely by decreased revenues and a heightened demand for accountability. Resources are diverted from one academic unit to another on the basis of quality indicators, one of which is the level of external monies generated. SCDEs are not on a level playing field, with fewer funds available for grants and contracts than many other academic units and with a lower priority in all-university development campaigns. This externally driven set of circumstances works against them in internal reallocations.

The limited resource base is constraining in a host of ways but not the least of which in the growing chasm between state of the art computing and communications technology, its availability to schools and colleges of education, and the opportunity of faculty and students therein to systematically examine their educational potential. Schools and colleges of education are increasingly populated by computer literate students (prospective teachers) who have but limited opportunity to expand and adapt these understandings about these technologies to enable learning for others in powerful ways. The educational applications of these technologies are simply not common priorities at this time.

Another major concern is the lack of curriculum coherence and articulation in education curricula and surely teacher education. Educational forums designed for examining divergent viewpoints by those who differ are not common. Education students, for example, move from one idiosyncratic course to the next, left to their own devices to reconcile one person's view of social constructivism with another's brand of critical theory. Instead of engaging in a rigorous examination of diverse viewpoints, students are too often left with a muddle of independent perspectives and a questionable, if not injurious, form of professional socialization.

Specific Challenges Facing Schools & Colleges of Education

After visits to many SCDEs across the nation, I have identified a set of interrelated goals around which progress must be made if professional schools of education are to thrive in these turbulent times. While comprehensive schools, colleges, and departments of education serve many purposes, the *sine qua non* function is the preparation —and continuing support—of the education professionals in U.S. schools. Since the corpus of knowledge to support these programs is only emerging, scholarly inquiry into teacher education is a related priority. Schools and colleges of education in research universities especially must continue to experiment with preparation programs driven by the question of: "What types of teachers do we need, and how can we best prepare them over time?" *Professional* schools of education will increasingly be asked to:

1. Demonstrate that they can contribute in a more direct and more visible manner to resolving problems and making improvements in K-12 schools, especially schools in poor neighborhoods;

2. Develop a clinical faculty that can guide novice teachers with strategies more potent than are typically employed and that are consistent with the best of contemporary understanding about learning to teach;

3. Further develop a corpus of scientific findings to guide how one learns to teach and to conduct much of that scholarship in schools and in collaboration with teachers and other school-based professionals;

4. Demonstrate that pedagogical content knowledge as well as knowledge of content exists in teacher preparation programs;

5. Demonstrate, as a corollary, that campus-based teacher education has a laboratory and a clinical capacity beyond that of the lecture hall;

6. Demonstrate that entry-level teachers can acquire the understandings, abilities, and dispositions to work with the growing plurality of pupils in many U.S. schools as well as teach subject matter to and with these youngsters in conceptually rich ways;

7. Demonstrate that initial teacher education can continue in a substantive and structured manner into the entry year(s) of teaching;

8. Achieve more coherent, more closely interrelated, and more potent programs of teacher preparation on campus as well as in schools. (Howey, 1992, p. 4)

The Essential Priority for Reform in Schools & Colleges of Education

From this perspective, schools and colleges of education face a very challenging, long-term reform agenda which, if achieved, would result in major transformations in the manner in which teachers are prepared. At the core of this reform agenda is the ability of the teacher education community to make substantive improvements in teaching and learning in the preparation of education professionals. While many factors contribute to student malaise and their lack of productive and persistent engagement in academic learning at every level of schooling, there is considerable evidence that the major problem is sterile and narrow instruction. Mary Kennedy, director of the Institute for Research on Teaching and Learning Across the Lifespan, underscores the centrality and significance of the problem:

> The improvement of [teaching] practice problem boils down to this: If we know that teachers are highly likely to teach as they were taught and if we are not satisfied with the way they were taught, then how can we develop different teaching strategies? How serious is the improvement of practice problem? I judge it to be very serious. We are caught in a vicious cycle of mediocre [teaching] practice modeled after mediocre practice...unless we find a way out of this cycle, we will continue recreating generations of teachers who recreate generations of students not prepared for the technological society we are becoming. (1991, p. 622)

The problem of sterile instruction is by no means limited to how youngsters can be more productively engaged in learning with and from one another in the confines of conventional classrooms. This is but one aspect of the teaching and learning transformation which needs to occur. Sizer (1992) urged the education community to view schooling, teaching and learning in a broader perspective, noting that television, not schools, may well be the foremost shaper of our evolving culture:

> Americans are but a decade from yet another technological leap forward, their connection by means of a nationwide fiber-optic network linking even larger numbers of individuals, schools, homes, universities, and businesses to a massive national database in effect, giving each individual access to a vast library. And there is more: It may be possible for the individual to interact with that "library" in creative ways: that is, to be far more than just a passive recipient of

what is "there to see." The computer, the telephone, and the television set will blend together—creating a yet more powerful "school" than even the ubiquitous TV set is today. What will be the economics of this new system? What public interest can it serve, and how will that public interest be stalwartly safeguarded? How will its existence change the purposes and shape of the schools, and what measures must be taken even now to energize the schools to accept and then to make those changes? (p. 26)

Certainly, the central problem of the improvement of instruction will not be resolved by those in schools and colleges of education imploring veteran teachers in our K-12 schools to demonstrate improved practice for our novice preservice teachers. Those of us in the teacher education community also need to interact with our prospective educational professionals in more potent forms of teaching and learning—both on and off campus and in laboratory and clinical settings designed specifically for inquiring into and analyzing the many complicated facets of teaching. Also, as teacher educators, we need periodically to demonstrate that we too can teach K-12 youngsters successfully. This is essential.

Progress can and is being made in these regards and the deans who author the chapters in this book are academic leaders in schools and colleges of education which provide many outstanding examples of high-quality teaching and teacher preparation. Rich insights have been gained into the myriad factors which influence and mediate academic learning generally. I have argued that the unique social context for learning in schools, whether schools of education or K-12 schools, manifests specific types of characteristics:

> Learning is an active process in that it goes beyond the reception of information as an individual. It calls for students to have the ability to responsibly monitor and to manage the various problem-solving activities that are embedded in learning tasks both as individuals and as members of a group, or better, community. Good learners can both critically examine the effort they make and the specific procedures they employ in their learning. Documentation and evaluation are ongoing activities integrated into learning, just as they are integral aspects of teaching. Teaching and learning are reciprocal with roles and responsibilities at times formally exchanged, and at other times naturally blended.
>
> Learning, in academic settings especially, is very often a social and community endeavor. Conceptual learning calls for thinking "out

loud" and sharing these problem-solving approaches with others. This learning community, or the classroom group as a whole, is responsible for its members. Members of a learning community understand not only what responsibility they have for their own learning but also their responsibility for assisting others in their learning as well. Learning and socially responsible behavior is monitored by the group or community as well as by the individual student. Effective learning is highly transportable and is often applied in contexts outside of the classroom and school. (1996, p. 162.)

This largely social constructivist view of teaching and learning flies in the face of traditional transmission views of teaching and absorptionist views of learning. These latter views are commonly decried in higher education and teacher education but are nonetheless still pervasively practiced. The higher education-teacher education community is too often a prime example of beliefs/practice discontinuity.

If faculty beliefs about teaching and learning and the conditions, traditions and cultural norms that mediate them are not addressed, on our own campuses as well as in K-12 schools, this longstanding cycle of mediocre teaching and limited teacher education will not be broken. This is the challenging task of "reculturing" that the deans in the subsequent chapter are addressing.

Underscoring the Direct Link between the Preparation of Education Personnel and the Organization & Practices of School

A second major challenge for the teacher education community is to make clear to policymakers and funding agents the direct and powerful linkages between initial teacher preparation and the nature of school organization and school renewal. Neither the commonly often constraining, structures of K-12 schools nor their capacity for self-renewal tend to be viewed as related in any direct way to how education professionals are prepared. Nonetheless, I argue that teachers do teach the way they do and are organized into the staffing arrangements and around curriculum patterns that commonly exist because that is, in fact, how they have been prepared. The independent preparation of key personnel for our K-12 schools—that is, teachers prepared separately from principals, media technologists, counselors, and even from one another—largely explains the bifurcated and often bureaucratic nature of support services designed to assist teachers but often achieving minimal success. Teacher educators

are faced with not only reconceptualizing much of teacher preparation but also how cross-role preparation (teachers, principals, lead teachers, counselors, media technologists, special educators) and interprofessional preparation (teachers along with social workers, legal services, health and family services) can begin to be achieved. For teacher education to influence schools that are dynamic and self-renewing and not static and obdurate in nature, I would suggest that we need (1) to give our prospective teachers more powerful tools for learning to teach over time; and (2) socialize them in very different ways than at present. Learning to teach demands sustained, at times structured, highly intellectual discourse among teachers regarding their beliefs, assumptions, intentions, actions, and justifications for actions. This is how one learns to teach over time. This pedagogical reasoning is the essence of both learning to teach and good teaching. Little (1996) reminds us that while most teachers describe the process of learning to teach as one of general trial and error, with occasional insights yielded by special events or relationships, promising practices can be identified and a vision of a school designed for teachers as well as students to learn can be seen more clearly. She suggests that:

> A school organized for teacher learning would promote the systematic study of teaching and learning in at least two ways: by supporting the individual and collaborative investigation of selected problems and questions that arise in teaching; and by developing the organizational habit of shared student assessment. In such a school, one would expect to find an established process by which teachers investigate the relationships among the academic work students are asked or invited to do, the support they are given to do it, and the work they produce. One would also expect to find teachers engaged in focused investigation of problems arising from practice; for example, problems in helping elementary school students to acquire a clear and deep understanding of fractions. (1996, pp. 4, 5)

The concept of a collaborative culture or learning community is common parlance in school reform initiatives today but this concept is neither commonly reflected in practice nor easily achieved. School cultures and beliefs tend rather to militate in powerful ways against this. It is here where changes in patterns of initial preparation across professional role groups is so essential. At the core of these restructuring efforts, teachers are needed who are both able and disposed to engage in a type of discourse that is rarely seen in schools today. To what degree are preservice teacher education programs addressing teacher collaboration and the development of school cultures defined by professional collegial-

ity, public teaching, and common exchanges around student learning? Advances are being made in the UNITE teacher education programs and many other places elsewhere, but I suspect the typical practice in teacher preparation today is to prepare teachers individually rather than as a part of a learning community. Increasingly, prospective teachers need to be organized in a variety of short-term cohort or learning-community arrangements designed to accomplish a variety of goals that can only be achieved in groups. The teacher education curriculum cannot be construed basically as a series of courses or as individual student teaching assignments. In carefully designed group settings and cohort arrangements, preservice teachers can learn effective team planning, engage in group-conducted case studies of children and contribute to a political action group. Together they can critically analyze instruction, provide accurate and helpful feedback about teaching and learning to teach to one another, engage in collaborative action research projects, and learn to teach in concert with one another rather than alone.

In summary, schools and colleges of education will have to conduct business quite differently than previously and do more with less—often substantially less. These challenges are considerable and in turn they call for considerable leadership.

The Need for Strong Leadership

The growing ferment across schools and colleges of education and the college or university in which they are located become increasingly obvious to me as a member of the research team which each year conducted the Research About Teacher Education (RATE) study for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Over an 8-year period from 1987 to 1995, our research team developed data sets about teacher education institutions and programs in which teachers were prepared across the United States. Among the clearer recent trends were efforts in schools and colleges of education to develop stronger links with K-12 schools and an emphasis on more thematic preparation programs calling for increased faculty collaboration. Both types of endeavors fly in the face of longstanding faculty norms around autonomy and individual responsibility, especially in research-oriented institutions. It became clear that strong leadership was needed more than ever in schools and colleges of education. Thus, we decided to study education deans as the distinctive aspect of the RATE study in 1991. As these deans were studied, data we examined underscored both the expanding challenges and the often dwindling resources.

The Deans' Views of Leadership & Reform

This study led to Nancy Zimpher and I founding the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE). We thought that we could learn a good deal about reform initiatives in teacher education if we could pull together a small network of schools and colleges of education located in or near urban settings and committed to assisting with improvements in inner-city contexts as an essential corollary to teacher education reform. We assumed that the participating institutions in this network could both support and learn from one another. Within UNITE, our intent was to explore ways of enhancing leadership capacity as well. Thus, a primary change strategy was to identify, prepare, and support four-person leadership teams who assumed complementary responsibilities for building capacity and working towards continuous improvement in SCDEs and cooperating K-12 schools.

In this book, deans in seven of the UNITE sites were asked to address their ideas, perspectives, and practices about change with a particular focus on teacher education reform. In UNITE, deans and other leaders attempted to be self-conscious about the leadership they provided in their reform initiatives. These deans wrote about their orientations to leadership and change and after two years in UNITE, they embarked on a process of developing cases of some of the salient change experiences which in turn stimulated further dialogue and debate about the place of deans in teacher education reform. These perspectives are captured in the chapters that follow.

The deans were at the center of these leadership teams and they were recruited to UNITE because they were broadly acknowledged as leaders both in and beyond their schools or colleges of education. While strong individual leaders, each of these deans was nonetheless concerned with broadening and deepening the leadership capacity in their schools or colleges of education. Thus, the leadership team concept that was developed incorporated both individuals already in a formal leadership role and faculty who exerted leadership without title or formal authority.

While the deans maintained their key responsibilities for organizational renewal and for building institutional capacity, a second individual took on teacher education program design and development and a third individual worked on strengthening and sustaining strong institutional relationships with schools, especially the intersection between reform in schools and reform in teacher preparation. Finally, a fourth member of the team took responsibility for faculty development needed to support these teacher preparation and school-oriented reform endeavors.

The operating assumption by network members was that higher education-teacher education faculty needed to reexamine what reforms were necessary in their own institutions. We also needed to examine what changes were demanded of us as college-based teacher educators as a corollary, if not precondition, to attempting to assist those in K-12 schools in their reform initiatives.

Several general themes surfaced in the deans' discussions when the urban network convened: building greater capacity for continuing renewal in their school or college, understanding and endorsing the idea of shared leadership, and especially investing in leadership preparation and support for roles where historically and even at present there is no leadership. For example, the UNITE participants especially saw a dearth of formal leadership in program design and faculty development in higher education. Program development is commonly an ad hoc endeavor emanating from the pervasive higher education "committee" approach to getting things done. While many schools and colleges of education have an individual in the dean's office responsible for external affairs, this typically is not a program development responsibility concerned, for example, with how partner and professional development schools (PDSes) might serve as a linchpin in mutual reform endeavors between the SCDE and the local district or districts. Similarly, there typically is no one who is charged with leadership for faculty development. Faculty development needs rather to be a by-product of the ongoing inquiry undertaken in the academy and is often self-directed in nature. Thus, a major goal in UNITE was to expand leadership capacity to focus specifically on activities that can stimulate renewal in these institutions. These leadership teams from across UNITE sites met together quarterly, sharing progress and problems encountered in their efforts to move their colleges forward. Sessions among the deans and their interactions with their local UNITE teams served as a continuing form of professional development. In these periodic sessions, the deans examined their approaches to leadership and the change strategies they pursued in their reform efforts. In this way, UNITE served as a means for these deans to reflect from time to time on their actions as leaders. This seemed especially important given the ferment of activity occurring at each site and the considerable demands made on these deans' time and energy. The importance of such reflection, dialogue, and analyses among these deans was underscored by Michael Fullan, one of the participating deans in the network. He wrote:

> I define change agentry as being self-conscious about the nature of change and the change process. Those skilled in change are appreciа-

> tive of its semi-unpredictable and volatile character, and they are explicitly concerned with the pursuit of ideas and competencies for coping with and influencing more and more aspects of the process toward some desired set of ends. They are open, moreover, to discovering new ends as the journey unfolds. (1993, p. 12)

The special cadre of deans who contributed to this book and to whom I am deeply indebted as UNITE director for their many contributions to this experiment in change include: Richard Arends, Central Connecticut State University; Michael Fullan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto; Gail Huffman-Joley, Indiana State University; Raphael O. Nystrand, University of Louisville; Richard Wisniewski, University of Tennessee; Sam Yarger, University of Miami; and Nancy L. Zimpher, Ohio State University. Special mention needs to be made of Dennis Thiessen, coeditor of this volume, and an experienced associate dean. Dennis insisted on our continuing attention to examining leadership and the ways in which it was manifested in various reform initiatives across these schools and colleges of education. I and the others who contributed to this book owe him a special debt of gratitude.

As a further backdrop for the chapter, I would like to share just a few of these seven deans' perceptions about leadership and change as these were revealed during the course of UNITE. I think they provide further context for interpreting the chapters which follow.

Richard Arends reports that successful changes in human settings require *good* ideas. His view is that one of the reasons that educational settings remain the same is that too many bad or faddish ideas have been promoted. Further, he argues that proposed changes must be planned for direct action and success. Many times, he emphasizes, action precedes goals and rationale (Fullan's idea of ready-fire-aim) and successful change often requires "lighting many fires" or actions at once.

Michael Fullan notes that leaders should (a) have good ideas and (b) listen to other peoples' ideas and try to legitimize both aspects. In trying new directions, he says, one should not panic when there is frustration, ambiguity, or questions. His view is that one should persevere but also be willing to step back and rethink. Acquiring skills and know-how is a cause, not a consequence, of ownership. He concludes that it is difficult for people to understand or be clear about a new direction if they have not acquired necessary skills and know-how.

Gail Huffman-Joley observes that leaders need to develop a culture for change by finding mechanisms, structures, and support for sustained dialogue among participants across disciplinary and departmental lines.

This helps to unify individuals and groups and encourages their movement in a common direction. It empowers them to move and implement change. She further argues that leaders need regularly to invite or "leave the door open" for more and more faculty to join change efforts. Huffman-Joley, seeking inclusivity, worked to avoid people feeling as if they are "in" or "out."

Raphael O. Nystrand states that he believes in setting goals that are based upon: a) core values (his and relevant others); b) an assessment of external environment; and c) strengths and weaknesses of our organization. The second major point he stresses is that he must get others to "buy into" these goals by demonstrating that: a) they are appropriate (i.e., consistent with values and external opportunities, expectations and constraints); b) they are achievable (i.e., "we can do it"); and c) that "we" will benefit by achieving these goals.

Richard Wisniewski concludes that to make changes in academic institutions, one must above all else be a student of one's institution and profession. He stresses that one needs to reflect on why things are as they are. Key questions for him are: What are the historical and social forces that define what we do? Are there opportunities for fresh thinking in the many situations and issues with which one must deal? How can practices be improved? Can we model practices that will strengthen the profession? To answer such questions, Wisniewski asserts that one must have a burning commitment to improve our institution.

Sam Yarger reminds us first that a leader's use of resources is, in effect, a statement of that leader's beliefs and values. Secondly he observes that it's valid to like people you don't trust (i.e., can't predict their behavior), and equally valid to trust people you don't like. In terms of change, he observes that the process of improving teacher education programs does not have a beginning and an end, just a beginning.

Nancy Zimpher observes that she followed one important principle: "You've got to have an idea. A long time ago, my mother taught me that to be in charge, which I like to be, you have to have an edge. I interpret that to be an orientation toward problem-solving that allows you to arrive at solutions to problems, just in case no one else has an answer. While my answers are not always, or even usually, right, I make sure that I have no shortage of responses to problems." Tending to see the creative side of a problem, her solutions are just a little on the loose or provocative side. Her view is that competent people can handle and shape these provocations into respectable strategies to problem-solving and proactive behavior.

She adheres to a second principle: If one can get faculty talking about an issue, there will be a good idea to resolve it somewhere in their

discussion. Thus, she chooses not to delineate specific plans with her faculty, staff, and students, but rather to set out a framework for the dialogue around which thoughtful people can fashion an agenda. Her goal has been to provide an organizer for substantive direction in the college and at the same time provoke more ownership for the agenda as generated by a broad-based and participatory decision-making structure.

Conclusion

The many subtleties and complexities of leadership—like those involved in teaching—often appear ethereal. Also, the very demands of leadership often leave little time for reflection and critical analysis. Nonetheless, these reflective habits and analytic skills can be honed in continuing discourse among those in leadership roles, such as was the situation in UNITE, and more importantly by leaders in concert with those who they would lead. Principles or theories of leadership ultimately can only be derived from practice by continuing examination of practice—and especially by those who are in these leadership positions. First-person examination of one's own leadership in challenging higher education contexts is only emerging in the literature. This book is a start in this direction with the deans describing their roles in reform initiatives in their schools and colleges of education. They have tested the waters of sharing these experiences so that comparisons about leadership and change could be made. I think that the reader will find their insights helpful as they examine the reform initiatives described in the following chapters.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1990). *RATE IV: Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* Washington, DC: AACTE.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). *RATE V: Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* Washington, DC: AACTE.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* New York: Falmer.

Gratt, G. (1992). *Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American education.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Howey, K.R. (1992). Teacher education in the United States: Trends and issues. *The Teacher Educator, 27*(4), 4.

Howey, K.R. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, and E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook on research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 143-170). New York: Macmillan.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of Land-Grant Universities. (1996, January). Joint statement of commission leaders. Battle Creek, MI:Author.

Kennedy, M.M. (1991, May). Policy issues in teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(9), 658-665.

Little, J. W. (1996, August-September). The right to learn and the advancement of teaching: Research, policy and practice for democratic education. *Educational Researcher, 25*(6), 5-18.

Matthews, A. (1997). *Bright college years: Inside the American campus today.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extra-ordinary performance in schools.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sizer, T.R. (1992, November). Sch-ol reform: What's missing. *World Monitor*, pp. 20-7.

Leadership for Change in Faculties of Education

Michael Fullan

This chapter examines the dean's role in leadership for change using a self-perspective. Emphasis has been placed on the dean's role, so the pronoun "I" is used several times in relation to strategies that I had initiated. But it should be always understood that these ideas were vetted, developed, and carried out by a larger group of leaders, especially the associate deans, department chairs, and key leaders of committees and programs. The development period in question concerns my deanship in the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto (FEUT), Canada, during the years 1988-96.

Context

Each case study of change must first be understood in terms of its context. As with all faculties of education in Ontario, there was a rapid expansion of faculty and student enrollment during the 1960s and early 1970s due to the large scale need for new teachers. Many of the faculty hired were master teachers, not selected for their research capabilities. There followed a period of decline in the need for new teachers (and thus faculty). There was a steady downward trend from 1974 to 1988 in which the faculty complement at FEUT declined from 132 to 81 FTE. Remarkably there was not one new faculty appointment during this 14-year period.

During this same era, a parallel institution was established by the Ontario government in 1965 called the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). Its mandate was to conduct research, field development (applied work with the educational systems), and graduate studies. Since OISE did not have degree-granting authority, it was affiliated from the beginning with the University of Toronto. In effect, FEUT was a faculty involved in initial teacher preparation and inservice teacher education, while OISE was literally the research and graduate department of education of the University of Toronto. By 1988, FEUT had 81 FTE faculty and over 1,000 student teachers, while OISE had 140 faculty and

over 2,500 part-time and full-time graduate students taking one of four degrees—M.Ed., M.A., Ed.D., Ph.D. In addition, FEUT had two laboratory schools—the Institute of Child Study (ICS) and the University of Toronto Schools (UTS); OISE had seven field centers dispersed throughout the province with the goal of working collaboratively with local schools and school districts to bring about improvement.

Since the 1980s, there had been growing discussion about integrating OISE and FEUT, a move regarded with great suspicion by one side or the other, depending on the particular time. A report of the Joint Committee on Education (a committee created in 1980) recommended a plan for integration in 1983, but the proposal died of inertia. In 1986, the government announced abruptly that OISE would be integrated into the University of Toronto. OISE, its considerable field-based clients, and the two political opposition parties combined to defeat the initiative. On the heels of this attempt, the affiliation agreement was coming to the end of its term and as such required review.

Although the integration attempt of the government had failed in 1986, the University of Toronto in the 1986-87 affiliation negotiations had wanted OISE and FEUT to merge, and was willing to do so under an affiliated agreement (as opposed to full integration into the university). The university was willing to consider this alternative because it felt that it was time for FEUT to make substantial changes, which seemed more sensible to carry out in the context of the full spectrum of FEUT and OISE mandates. Since the university could not accomplish this through bringing OISE into the university, it was willing to consider FEUT in effect going to OISE, connected to the university through an affiliation agreement. These negotiations eventually failed as OISE wanted more revenues to come with FEUT than the university was willing to allocate.

While these negotiations were ongoing, the university had delayed the search for a new dean for 1986 extending the appointment of the incumbent for an additional year (1986-87). With the aborted discussions behind, the university proceeded with a provostial review of the faculty of education which was standard procedure at the end of a decanal term. Virtually everyone agreed that FEUT had become seriously stagnant (although the matter of who was to blame was more debatable). The provostial review confirmed this assessment and made six major recommendations:

1. The University of Toronto should not agree to future changes in the arrangements for FEUT and OISE that do not meet the following conditions:

- There should be full and genuine integration of FEUT and OISE.
- Academic excellence be the major aim.
- There should be a strong university presence in the control of academic programs.
- There should be adequate funding for undergraduate and graduate work at a very high standard.

2. The level and quality of research should be improved.

3. A planned process of faculty renewal should be the highest priority.

4. A full review of teaching programs should be undertaken with a view to ensuring quality.

5. Greater collaboration should be established between FEUT and UTS and ICS.

6. Assessment of needs for improved facilities and equipment should be undertaken.

These recommendations informed the decanal search which took place in spring 1987.

Provostial reviews, even ones that draw accurate conclusions, do not necessarily result in effective action. The immediate future was quite unknown, even though the diagnosis of what was wrong was clear. The decanal search which included several FEUT faculty and some students resulted in my appointment as dean which I took up early in 1988. I was an unknown to FEUT, but as an OISE faculty member, I came from an institution that at best did not understand FEUT's culture. I also had just finished, with my colleagues Michael Connelly and Nancy Watson, a review of teacher education for an Ontario Commission (1987). We made a number of recommendations for reform in teacher education, indicating that change was badly needed, and that the next several years would be critical. We noted that faculty renewal, research and inquiry, and field-based partnerships needed urgent attention in the province's faculties of education. In the course of discussions with the Search Committee and the provostial chair of the committee, I indicated that I was interested in the position only if the university was serious about its commitment to sustained reform in the faculty. We agreed on a rather detailed letter that set out major multi-year commitments to faculty renewal in light of the considerable number of upcoming retirements.

As a student of educational change, I was also attracted to the deanship as an opportunity to engage in real reform. My personal theories and reflections about leadership and change have been formed (and are continuously being reformed) by a two-way relationship between the doing of change and the study of change (i.e. reflections on my own situations, and writing about the larger field of change). The doing of change is constantly instructive provided that one has a working theory of change and is willing to learn from events and other people.

Some of the key principles that inform my thinking and doing of change, which will be illustrated in subsequent sections include:

- The importance of expressing what you value (having good ideas) and extending what you value (listening to other people's good ideas).
- The need to engage in ready-fire-aim mobilization strategies which build knowledge, skills, commitment, and ownership.
- The need to make the nature of the new organizational change explicit while not devaluing the existing culture. I later call this "making reculturing explicit."
- The need to pursue projects, partnerships and other initiatives that widen horizons, present value-added (vs. ad hoc) opportunities, and create conditions of pressure and support to go further.
- The critical importance of establishing a broader leadership base, and core decanal support group that widens and increases the capacity for action and problem-solving that is less dependent on the dean.
- The need to stay at it. Change takes several years. Persistence is necessary, but so is a different conception of time and patterns. Change is not linear. What looks like slow going can erupt in breakthroughs. Various investments may not result in immediate payoff, but some can interconnect in surprising ways at later times. Thus, what is needed is persistence, allowing for time to elapse, and looking for and supporting emerging patterns compatible with, but not necessarily predicted by, the general direction being pursued.

The Beginning

I started my preparation for the dean's role in fall 1987, for a position that I was taking up on February 1, 1988. I met with small groups of faculty prior to taking up the post. I followed the ready-fire-aim strategy.

I told faculty groups:

- I believe in action sooner than later; therefore, I do not recommend that we set up yet another task force to study the problem.

- I expressed the new things that I thought were important: focus on the teacher education continuum; establish partnerships with schools and school districts; link teacher education and school improvement including field-based teacher education; pursue inquiry and research in these partnerships; develop pilot innovations.

- I said that I did not expect everyone to become so engaged, but I was extending an invitation to those who were interested.

As a footnote of reflection, I thought I was suggesting in a flexible way some new directions and that people should have choice (you don't have to do these things if you don't want to). I found out later that the interpretation was (in the words of one faculty member): "The train is leaving the station and if you want to get on it, you better do so." In fact, however, we did move slowly (but steadily), and I did grow to appreciate the existing culture, while not losing sight of the new directions. The existing culture was characterized by a strong commitment to teaching and students, and a willingness to cooperate, along with a sense of hurt pride at not being respected in the university or valued more widely in the field. In fact, the faculty had engaged in one field-based program a decade before the new developments initiated in the post-1988 period (Martin, 1990).

With this background, we engaged in a number of interrelated strategies to bring about reform. Most were conceived in advance. Some involved taking advantage of opportunities, but these too were informed by the guiding conception of what we were trying to accomplish, and how we were going about it. In a word, it involved transforming the faculty culture, while retaining aspects of the previous culture. It also involved instilling pride in the faculty through internal development, and external visibility by being on the leading edge of new ideas in teacher education.

Strategies for Reform

The start, then, was somewhat unpredictable—a recognition of the need for change, but no clear idea of what it might mean in practice. We used several mutually reinforcing strategies to develop this clarity including:

- Faculty renewal
- Partnerships

- Program innovation "followed" by planning
- Focus on research
- Making reculturing explicit
- Looking for value-added opportunities
- Relationships to the central university

Faculty Renewal

In accepting the position, I negotiated in writing that the highest priority would be placed on faculty renewal, and that we would be able to replace nearly all those who were on a long list of retirements. The Provostial Review Committee had recommended that a faculty complement plan should be developed and approved prior to commencing faculty searches. I took the position that the faculty was so far behind that we needed to have new faculty immediately. The provost agreed that we could begin five searches without developing a plan.

We began advertising for these positions in fall 1987 prior to my arrival. This was unheard of, since there had not been a new position since 1974. It was a sign that things were about to change. We were helped by a large number of retirements—11 in June 1987 and 10 in July 1988. In other words, 21 of the 81 faculty retired in 12 months (aided by a early retirement scheme). We committed ourselves to conducting approximately five searches per year for the foreseeable future.

There was no set procedure for hiring. There were no strong autonomous departments. In the first year I had initiated a change that resulted in the consolidation of some 21 "departments" (many of which were small subject-based clusters) into 4 departments. Since there had been no new appointments for 14 years, there was no entrenched hiring process. I placed a major personal priority on faculty appointments by chairing all the committees, and by appointing the other three members—an associate dean and two other faculty members. We followed an open process of publishing the short list, obtaining input from all concerned, and deliberating until all views were heard. We essentially made consensual decisions.

In the selection criteria, we emphasized:

- field-based teacher education—we wanted people who were good at and committed to working with teachers and schools in partnerships;

- research and inquiry—people committed to scholarship and inquiry, especially in applied settings;
- collaborative skills—people wanting to work in teams and help build a collaborative culture.

These three criteria were critical to the reculturing agenda by 1994, we had a critical mass of faculty who supported and were actively involved in defining a common direction. I have to say that the main obstacle we faced was cultural rather than political. Political barriers have to do with power. There are certainly many examples of groups of faculty banding together to prevent change. Many a reform-minded dean has underestimated the political power and persistence of established professors against a new direction for the faculty (see especially Fenstermacher, 1996). This was not the case in our situation (no doubt aided by the departure of a large number of tenured faculty).

Rather, the issue we faced was cultural, i.e. doubt and uncertainty about what the new direction meant—was it clear, was it a good idea, will we lose the valuable traditions we have, will I fit into the new order of things? It was also the case that many of the existing faculty wanted to see changes. They knew that the faculty had become stagnant. They complained about the negative culture that had evolved through the years of deprivation—that the faculty had lost pride in itself, that they might no longer have the internal capacity to make changes, and that the university had been unwilling to invest in the faculty.

I will always remember a faculty member on the first search committee when we were establishing a short list who said, "we don't want X person on the list because he is too much like us." There was a consciousness, albeit vague and ambivalent, that we were searching for a new breed.

Over the last 7 years, we have hired some 35 new faculty while 45 of the original 81 have retired. Most of these new hires are between 35 and 45 years of age with extensive field experience, recent doctorates, and commitment to working in a collaborative manner. There has been no intergenerational conflict. In some ways, older faculty helped younger faculty get to know the university, and helped with preservice teaching as newcomers coped with the heavy demands of an 8-month teacher education program. Yet, new faculty maintained their goals of innovation, research, and inquiry. Many long-standing faculty participated in program innovation as they too had been frustrated by the years of stagnation and welcomed the opportunities that became possible. The result by 1996 is that FEUT now has a large critical mass of faculty committed to new directions, and has dramatically increased the percent-

age of women faculty (from less than 10 percent to more than 40 percent). The main difficulty in faculty hirings has been the inability to increase the percentage of visible minorities on staff. The latter remains a priority of the immediate future. We have increased the percentage of minority students (from 4 percent in 1988 to approximately 20 percent now), as well as redesigned programs to provide teacher education in multicultural field-based settings.

In sum, faculty renewal was an obvious powerful strategy of reform and certainly the situation of many retirements made it possible. But it is not as straightforward as having the opportunity. It must be used in a way that builds greater and greater ownership among the existing and new faculty alike, while avoiding divisive intergenerational or interdepartmental conflict. Recall that no one was forced or expected to change what they were doing if they did not want to. Clearly, however there was an atmosphere of pressure and support pointing in new directions.

Finally, I believe that the conflict around faculty appointments was minimal for several reasons. First, people were appreciative of the opportunity to hire on such a large scale—an opportunity represented by the dean. Second, the criteria helped as did the generally cooperative culture of the faculty. Third, the process—a combination of openness and focused decision-making—was effective. Fourth, and most importantly, excellent new colleagues arrived on the scene and were immediately appreciated. Put another way, relatively centralized decision-making is acceptable under certain conditions provided that (a) one consults openly, and (b) the decisions turn out to be successful (i.e., perceived and experienced as successful).

Partnerships

Just prior to my arrival, FEUT established a major partnership with four large school districts and OISE. Called the Learning Consortium, its first day of operation was my first day on the job—February 1, 1988. This was a deliberate strategy of renewal, both as a signal that field-based partnerships were the way to go, and through the substance of activities that the consortium presented.

It was formed partly from the ideas for a review of teacher education which was completed just prior to my appointment as dean (Fullan, et al. 1987), and partially because the directors (superintendents) of education of the four boards approached me individually, after my appointment was announced, wanting to work on some new in-service programs. I suggested that instead of working individually we form a collective. Thus the consortium was born.

We each contributed $20,000 annually for a total of $120,000 (the four districts, FEUT, and OISE). We used this money to hire a full-time executive director and part-time secretary. We set out our mandate:

- Working on the teacher education continuum
- Linking teacher development and school development
- Restructuring the districts to foster and coordinate school-based development
- Restructuring the faculty of education to support field-based program innovation
- Focus on research and inquiry locally and internationally

A planning group consisting of one representative from each partner and the executive director was charged with developing an agenda. I served as the FEUT representative for the first several years. We also took a ready-fire-aim approach, and planned our first summer institute in rapid fashion starting planning in February and conducting the first institute in August 1988. Over 100 attended a five-day residential institute, which included teams— the principal and two or three teachers from some 20 schools, central office personnel, and eight faculty from FEUT (all of whom were veteran faculty as new faculty had not been appointed). Faculty professors as learners alongside teachers, principals, and superintendents was unheard of, although later some faculty told me that they attended out of curiosity to find out what was going on.

The institute's focus was on "Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Work Cultures, and the Management of Change." I co-led the institute with Barrie Bennett and Carol Rolheiser who had just been seconded from Edmonton by the consortium (they were later to become tenured professors on the faculty). The first summer institute was a huge success judging from the evaluations and the enthusiasm generated by the experience. It was a signal of things to come, and immediately to be tested as follow-up implementation support was built into the design.

A few observations can be made about the Learning Consortium's evolution over the past 7 years. First, it has been very successful in mobilizing large numbers of teachers, administrators and faculty members. We now have numerous teacher leaders and others who pursue best practices and created a culture of change. Second, the consortium had problems along the way. Another change lesson came in handy: "problems are our friends," in which we said that if substantial change was attempted, problems would inevitably be encountered, and the effective

organization is not one that has an absence of problems, but one that solves problems. Thus, when problems started to arise we expected them, and the planning group set about resolving them (such as are collective summer institutes always required? Can a district hold one of their own? Would this activity be seen as competing with or disloyal to the consortium?). Third, I deliberately saw the Learning Consortium, and said this publicly, as a strategy to help create pressure and support for us to change ourselves. It was not just a project, but a means of contributing to a new way of life.

In retrospect, the Learning Consortium is a prime example that embodies many of the leadership strategies I used at the outset. It was quintessential ready-fire-aim—a few key guiding principles, immediate action, consolidation, and focus arising from the experience. It was typical also of my leadership in which I played a prominent role in the first few years, then backing off as it became established and took on a life of its own. It signaled to local school districts that we were on the move. It gave visibility locally and internationally as the Learning Consortium became known through its successes and through its research, dissemination, and involvement in national and international arenas. It provided an early marker and symbol of success.

Program Innovation "followed" by Planning

Program innovation, in the first instance, involved inviting faculty to develop program options as pilot projects, based on the directional principles (cohorts of students, teams of faculty, field-based partnerships, inquiry oriented, etc.).

Proposals were developed and approved by Faculty Council, but in the spirit of pilot projects. The priority was to get some new models, and new experiences underway. These options or pilots commenced in 1988, and by 1995, we had 11 options in place involving a large proportion of students in cohorts ranging from 30 to 90 students each.

In 1988, the invitation to engage in new field-based options was issued. We conducted an informal review in 1988 through two committees (one focusing on the elementary program; the other on secondary) culminating in a residential retreat for all faculty in 1989 which clarified some of the guiding principles. Experiments started in earnest (note the quick start-up time) in 1989. As the experiments increased in number we established in 1990-91 a Strategic Planning Process involving a review of progress and an in-depth retreat facilitated by an external consultant.

I played a key role in initiating the idea of the retreats, participating fully in expressing ideas, but also listening carefully and to others who

had chaired and were members of review committees. We were also careful in the review committees, and policy committees to include a combination of veteran and new faculty members. We tried to build up diversity of viewpoints and experiences from the beginning.

The second retreat in 1991 was meaningful and productive precisely because people were debating the pros and cons of activities that they were already trying out. The retreat itself resulted in a series of action groupings which served as mechanisms to carry forward activities among interested faculty clusters, such as a faculty development group focusing on improvement of teaching and continuous faculty support. The initiatives helped to broaden the leadership base in the faculty.

Subsequently, as an integrating device, we formed in 1993 a Task Force to Restructure the Teacher Education Program. Following extensive deliberations and debates, the task force presented a plan for revising the entire teacher education program, which was adopted by Faculty Council in June 1994. Although I made some centralized decisions at the beginning (such as the creation of the Learning Consortium), I worked increasingly closely with the Faculty Council over the years. The task force, for example, was cochaired by the chair of the program committee of the Faculty Council and me. This is another example of playing a prominent role, but doing so in close collaboration with the existing decision-making structure.

The story became more complicated as program policy and innovation interacted with provincial policy on teacher education, and with the decision to merge OISE and FEUT which was ratified in December 1994 to take effect in July 1996. From a strategy vantage point, that program innovation was and remains a major r-ate to defining and learning about the future which in turn provides a framework for subsequent discussions and actions. The sequence in our case was Ready (key principles to direct action), Fire (pilot projects trying out these principles), Aim (consolidation of tentative conclusions), Future Focus (program decisions, and plans to guide the next stage of development). Program innovation, then, is both a means and an outcome of institutional development. It also gave everyone a platform for research as I stressed at the outset that people should make their own teaching/program a focus of inquiry and scholarship.

Focus on Research

Another priority, arising from the Provostial Review and forming a mandate from 1988 onward was to improve the level and quality of research in FEUT. We made this an explicit goal, hired new faculty consistent with this goal, and provided incentives and support. I also

expected that a significant increase in involvement would provide the critical mass of peer support and pressure necessary to propel this activity forward and institutionalize it through peer participation. In 1987, there were two faculty out of 81 who presented research papers at the Canadian Society for Studies in Education (CSSE)—the Canadian equivalent of the American Educational Research Association (AERA)—and none at AERA. Within 5 years, we had more than 35 faculty presenting papers at CSSE and AERA. The new norm had a life of its own as new faculty were hired who were committed to research and inquiry, as existing faculty joined in to develop and present papers at conferences, and as incentive and support systems were altered. Six examples of the latter were:

- With the exception of 2 years when we had budget problems, all newly hired junior faculty were given an .80 teaching assignment in their first two years of employment to support research development and faculty renewal.
- A fund was established to provide "automatic" financial support annually to each and every faculty member who was presenting a paper to a research conference.
- Annual merit pay was based on both teaching and research recognizing new research emphases.
- The university provided research grants of up to $6,200 for all newly hired, tenure stream faculty.
- Through the efforts of an associate dean, a research infrastructure was developed which provided workshops, information, advice, and support for the development of research proposals and opportunities for funding.
- A small but powerful new unit was created, Technology for Enhancing Learning (TEL), which served the needs of faculty and staff—a unit which has grown considerably in its central importance to the institution.

The new result, without question, was a substantial increased level of activity among faculty in research conferences, research grants, publications, and in general visibility and presence in the province, the country and internationally. No one could have missed the fact that FEUT was becoming an active player on the wider scene. I supported, directly and indirectly, this development through my own modeling and involvement in scholarship, often in conjunction with other members of the faculty.

At the same time, circumstances inhibiting the development of research were evident. First, junior faculty were heavily engaged in the time-consuming (albeit rewarding) activities of field-based teaching (even if they were on a .80 teaching assignment, the overall teaching load was sizable, and the nature of the work was demanding). Second, new faculty were also involved in responsibilities traditionally reserved for senior faculty members, such as coordinators, chairs of key committees, members of program reviews, and merit committees. These activities represented essential socialization experiences, and the forging of new norms, but they consumed time and energy. Third, since there were virtually no graduate programs, there was a ceiling effect to how faculty could move into full-fledged graduate level research and inquiry. (Indeed, one of the driving forces of the merger with OISE was to fulfill the objective of becoming a full-service faculty of education with scope for working with graduate students and programs.)

In sum, research and inquiry has become firmly established as a goal of the faculty, and is intrinsically valued and pursued by most faculty. Workload, workload equity, and organizational arrangements remain as constraints to further development.

Making Reculturing Explicit

The strategy of making reculturing explicit may seem too straightforward, but it is enormously important. These days, colleges of education are involved in new partnerships and numerous innovations, but they rarely make internal development an explicit goal. The simultaneous part of university and school/ district renewal advocated by John Goodlad is not so reciprocal as the burden of renewal falls asymmetrically on the school/district side of the equation. It is imperative that colleges of education make the content and processes of internal development (i.e. reculturing of the college of education) explicit and public for themselves and their constituencies.

The internal development of colleges of education remains elusive as evidenced by the AACTE publications on the role of deans (Bowen, 1996) and the Holmes Group study for the Ford Foundation (Fullan et al, 1998).

It is, as I have said, essential that reform be pursued with an direct awareness that we are also fundamentally talking about changing the culture and actions of colleges of education. It helps significantly to make this agenda explicit, and to become preoccupied with its development. As one strategy of explicitness, I wrote a short fable in 1991, "The Best Faculty of Education in the Country." I listed 10 goals or characteristics.

Such a faculty would:

1. Commit itself to producing teachers who are agents of educational and social improvement

2. Commit itself to continuous improvement through program innovation and evaluation

3. Value and practise exemplary teaching

4. Engage in constant inquiry

5. Model and develop lifelong learning among staff and students

6. Model and develop collaboration among staff and students

7. Be respected and engaged as a vital part of the university as a whole

8. Form partnerships with schools and other agencies

9. Be visible and valued internationally in a way that contributes locally and globally

10. Work collaboratively to help develop provincial and national networks

These were not decision-making platforms, but rather normative strategies of what we were striving for. I did not attempt to establish them as a mission or policy, but rather wanted them to percolate through normative consciousness. I knew they were compatible with emerging ideas and commitments in the faculty but it also made these issues more explicit.

To take two examples: first, if we say, as we did, that we were advocating that teachers and schools should develop collaborative work cultures, one must immediately ask a series of embarrassing questions: What is there in the very design of our teacher preparation program that deliberately (by program, curriculum, and assessment of outcomes) produces graduates who are committed to and skilled in collaboration; what is there in the structure and reward system of the faculty that rewards and models collaboration among its professors? The answer traditionally is: not much!

Similarly, if colleges of education advocate continuous improvement of teaching as a core feature of schools, the question should not be far behind as to what the colleges are doing to systematically ensure, by design and practice, the continuous development and improvement of teaching among its own professors. Again, not much, historically. In our

own case, faculty development and the improvement of teaching did become a priority, led by faculty members who helped create the initiative in the 1992 retreat.

Why did I write the fable? And, why in 1991? It was certainly not part of a conscious a priori strategy, but it (or something like it) almost inevitably follows from a preoccupation with making reculturing explicit. By thinking about reculturing continuously, by experiencing new forms of it, and by being committed to express what I value, it was timely to try to describe briefly, what some of its features might be. I did not make the mistake of introducing it officially. I thought it would be more helpful to share it informally. This is what I mean by 'percolating through normative consciousness'. To be effective, such writing also has to connect with the values and experiences of faculty. The leader's role is sometimes to capture and feedback, in more explicit and articulate terms, new things that people are already doing. It is also worth noting that the fable was also published in the main university-wide paper on campus, as part of repositioning FEUT in the university.

The solution, or at least the direction of the solution, is as powerful as it is obvious—make the goals and content of reculturing explicit. Get people talking about and working on the questions: what kind of culture do we have; what kind would we like; and how do we get there? It is only when peers struggle with the issues in a transparent manner that any movement is possible. I recommend that explicit reculturing be a preoccupation of colleges of education over the next 5 to 10 years.

Looking for Value-Added Opportunities

There is a fine line between taking on every interesting opportunity that comes along and becoming involved in new initiatives that help deepen, strengthen, and extend learning and capacity. I refer to the latter as value-added opportunities. You can never tell for sure if the activity is going to be successful, but it helps if a series of questions is asked in advance—Is the idea interesting and deeply compatible with what we are attempting to do? Are there at least two or more faculty intrinsically willing to take a lead role? (I would shy away from projects that are funded and staffed entirely through external funds, even if money was not the problem—better off to say no and not take the money). Does it extend our networks and learning opportunities for staff?

The Learning Consortium in 1988 was the first example of this strategy, as were bilateral partnerships with individual school districts and partner schools. When the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE) opportunity presented itself we readily joined the other

eight faculties in a multi-year effort, because it enabled a core group of four people to engage in faculty development in interaction with their colleagues both internally and across the nine faculties. UNITE's focus is on program innovation in field-based teacher education programs, on faculty and leadership development, and on inquiry documentation and dissemination of findings—all goals compatible with our own capacity-building needs.

Similarly, we signed a multi-year contract with the Aga Khan University in Karachi, Pakistan, to help support the development of a newly established Institute of Educational Development (IED). Six to eight of our faculty are playing leading roles in supporting and conducting research with IED staff in creating a new institution devoted to field-based teacher education.

All colleges of education on the move engage in this kind of work, but the criteria stated above are important. Is the project compatible with where we think we want to go, and is there at least a small group of faculty who are intrinsically interested in putting their energy into making it a success? These kinds of projects operationalize guideline 9 in the fable—be visible and valued internationally in a way that contributes locally and globally.

Relationships to the University

In our case, the initial support at the time of the provostial review and my appointment as dean in 1988 was positive but not particularly deep. The president and the provost committed in writing to devoting replacement resources to the faculty over the term of my 7-year appointment, and were indeed very supportive in the remaining two or so years of their tenure.

We started without great visibility in the university. I did not attempt to participate actively in the world of my decanal or provostial colleagues, nor to advertise what we intended to do. Rather, we started internally and with our constituents. In terms of the use of my time, the internal development of the faculty and external networks in the province and internationally were more interesting and I thought of greater benefit. In the first 3 years, I was not well known among the other deans. Also, I failed to monitor the budget closely enough and was confronted with a budget deficit situation in 1991, something certainly frowned upon by decanal colleagues, not to mention presidents and provosts. It was at this time that I started to give greater priority to relationships with the rest of the university, as well as to the budget deficit (we now have a surplus).

In 1990, the dean of law was appointed president of the university. He visited me and said that he was committed to being president over the next 10 years if the university would have him, and that he felt he could only do three or so major things over the decade. He wanted the development of the education faculty to be one of these priorities. Gary Fenstermacher (1996) calls it luck interacting with more substantive plans.

While we were developing at the faculty, a new central administration team was being put together at the university. Because we were doing more and accomplishing more, we became gradually more visible inside and outside the university. We worked more and more closely with the president and the newly appointed provost, and other members of the central administration. I increased my interaction with other deans and faculty in the university. The president became a major figure in the support of one of our lab schools, the University of Toronto Schools (UTS), when the government withdrew funding.

In February 1994, the Minister of Education called a meeting of the president and the director of OISE to consider the merger of OISE and the faculty of education. Two phases followed which radically deepened the involvement, interaction, and mutual commitment between the faculty of education, and the university as a whole including very specifically the president and the provost.

The first phase involved the tripartite negotiation of the merger agreement among OISE, the University of Toronto, and the Ontario government. This took place from February to December 1994 at which time the agreement was signed by all parties. This was a complex process which at several points appeared doomed. The critical issue here is that the president invested enormous energy in helping to make it happen. During this time, especially in the September to December months, there was daily interaction between the president and me including weekends. It was during this phase that the university president, the provost and I, as dean, developed a strong sense of rapport, knowledge, and mutual respect and commitment .

The second key phase covered the planning for the merger, which took place from January 1995 to June 1996. This was the phase when the provost and his staff, and joint representatives of the faculty and OISE, worked on the formation of a comprehensive academic plan—again resulting in a deeper knowledge-base and commitment to the goals of integration and reform, between the provost and the new faculty to be established July 1, 1996.

Following a search, I was appointed dean-designate of the new OISE/UT in July 1995 to take effect in July 1996. A large part of this development involved taking advantage of the initial support from the university

by working specifically to build and consolidate a strong mutual commitment between the central administration and the faculty. Its success is due to a fortunate combination of circumstances—from doing the right things under those circumstances and staying at it over a period of years. The right things were building the capacity of the faculty through the previous six strategies. In effect, these developments established the foundation that ensured the level of support we got from the president and the provost during the merger deliberations and decisions.

Reflections on Leadership

I first want to comment on the importance of commitment and persistence over a period of years. My initial term as dean was to be 7 years and 5 months (I started in the midst of a sabbatical in February 1988 and the term was slated to go to June 30,1995). In fall 1994, the provost conducted an informal review of my leadership in order to extend my appointment for one year (at the time, the OISE negotiations were ongoing and indeterminate and some action had to be taken with respect to 1995-96). I remember thinking at the time that things were falling into place, but that it had taken 6 years for this to happen. What crystallized in 1994 was a majority of faculty who "owned" the new direction.

As I view these years, there was great uncertainty and doubt between 1988 and 1992 as to whether we were getting anywhere, and/or whether we were heading in the right direction. If one had conducted a study in 1992 or 1993, it would have been a mixed report card on reform. By 1994, however, it had come together. In his informal review with department chairs and other leaders in the faculty, the provost received a resounding endorsement of the extension of my appointment and of the faculty's state and direction.

The mystery of change always fascinates me. One can be slugging away for several years not knowing whether one is getting anywhere, and then, almost by magic, patterns crystallize, seemingly (but not really) overnight. It takes half a dozen years or more to see this through. Employing promising strategies, refusing to be discouraged in the early years, and sticking with the process are essential to accomplishing reform.

On the personal side, it is very difficult to talk about (let alone accurately portray) the kind of leader I am. The best I can do is to reflect on what I think I am doing, realizing that it will be a biased version. I think a lot about my overcommitments: on some days observing that it is powerfully synergistic, on other days realizing that I am spread too thin. My academic interests (the study of change) overlap with my decanal

responsibilities (the doing of change). I find that I am most stimulated by the synergy of being a dean in a reform-minded institution, conducting inquiry and writing about change, and giving speeches, workshops, consultations on change, etc. There is a price to pay—there is less time to spend on community-building activities and events with faculty, staff, and students.

Second, I select a team that consists of superb leaders, problem-solvers and team players—associate deans, department chairs, faculty, registrar, financial officer, technology head, secretaries, executive assistants, etc. The core group in the dean's office meets regularly, works well together, and has a blend of feeling free to act autonomously in the context of common institutional directions, and in concert with others on the team. With the advent of e-mail and faxes, there is an exceedingly strong communication system, along with face-to-face work. I am out of the building a great deal, but still feel a strong connection because of the team we have built, who always checks and keeps in touch with each other, solves many day-to-day problems before they approach the dean, knows when to contact me, and meets regularly - all with the context of policies and directions set collectively. It may be part rationalization, but I think the combination of my presence and absence, in the context of a strong team combines both a sustained vision, and the broadening of leadership capacity, which is less dependent on the dean in a day to day sense and may provide a stronger basis for continuation after I leave the deanship.

Third, I try to live the advice that Andy Hargreaves and I gave to principals in *What's Worth Fighting For In Your School* (1996). We said that effective principals (leaders) express what they value and extend what they value. In other words, it is important to have good ideas and to be willing to express them (the visionary part if you like), but it is equally important to listen and learn to extend what you value in others. This blend produces the best outcomes and helps to create a wider base of ownership, again less dependent on the center, but still requiring interaction and periodic syntheses about what the faculty stands for.

To conclude, reading AACTE's *The Wizards of Odds* (Bowen, 1996) caused me to reflect on the crisis of reform that colleges of education have and will be facing. The three deans in *Wizards* represent the first phase—roughly 1980 to 1987. There was not much knowledge, networks, or momentum to go on in these pioneering years, and it showed as these struggles are so openly portrayed by the deans. This chapter is part and parcel of a second phase—the late 1980s to the mid-1990s. Here there is more knowledge, more kindred spirits to interact with inside and outside the college of education, but still not much has happened on any scale.

We are, as we enter the third phase—1996 into the next century—at a critical juncture in teacher education reform. The reform of colleges and leadership therein (deans and faculty leadership) is of fundamental importance to the reform of teacher education, indeed to the reform of education itself. The knowledge base is occurring as we enter this third phase and there are many more faculties engaged in reform. There is also a growing realization that leadership, reform in teacher education, and reform in education itself must be closely linked (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998). John Goodlad's "simultaneous renewal" of universities and school systems (indeed educational systems more broadly) should very much be the domain of reform-minded leaders in colleges of education.

Yes, as Fenstermacher (1996) has observed, context is everything and luck matters. But contexts change and luck improves. Not always, and that's what makes it interesting.

References

Bowen, R. (Ed.) (1996). *The wizards of odd: Leadership journeys of education deans.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1996). From Camelot to Chechnya: The journey of an education dean. In R. Bowen (Ed.), *The wizards of odd: Leadership journeys of education deans.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Fullan, M., Connelly, M. & Watson, N. (1987). *Teacher education in Ontario: Current practices and options for the future.* Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Education and Training.

Fullan, M., Galluzzo, G., Morris, P. & Watson, N. (1998). *The rise and stall teacher education reform.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school. Revised Edition.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Martin, R. (1990). Field-based preservice teacher education: Reflections on an experiment. *McCall Journal of Education,* 25 (2), pp. 257-273.

THE NEW SISYPHUS: The Dean as Change Agent

Richard Wisniewski

I have served on five university faculties and as dean at two institutions: 9 years at the University of Oklahoma and 12 at the University of Tennessee. I know my strengths, my limitations, and my wistfulness at the "road not taken." I have a sense of accomplishment well tempered by frustrations and mistakes. I believe that deans ought to be change agents. I have learned over and over what is possible and impossible in academic institutions. Nonetheless, I have not learned that distinction perfectly; I still believe the impossible just takes a bit longer.

It is easy to rationalize one's efforts. Can I reveal what I know about change in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) without comparing myself to others? Can I be objective? Am I taking credit where credit is not due? I can only outline some of what I have learned about being an advocate for change, however modest my attainments.

As a new dean, would I have followed the advice that follows? Probably not, because I never thought much about becoming a dean. Academic life appealed to me and I made decisions that enabled me to become a professor. Given my roots and abilities, I thought this was a rather remarkable achievement and never gave any thought to becoming an administrator. The idea that I would someday be a dean responsible for a college—or, in my case, two colleges—never entered my mind.

Nonetheless, I served one year as an interim department head because I was asked to do so. Since the department had only three faculty in it, I was not overwhelmed by administrative duties. I became an assistant dean within a few years of earning my doctorate for the same reason: I was asked to do so. I was flattered to be asked and accepted the roles despite feelings of ill-preparedness. I saw them as temporary assignments, believing I would soon be a professor again.

I was wrong. The flow of events, more than a plan to "get ahead" or to "claw my way to the top," explain much. I also was too new to higher education—indeed, awed by university life—to comprehend its foibles and rigid practices.

While my career has been by and large unplanned, the fact that I became an administrator led me to explore positions where I could continue in an administrator's role. If I had remained a professor, I likely would only have explored other positions as a professor, but not because of a burning desire to climb the academic ladder. In other words, I applied for what I already was doing since it was pretty much what I knew how to do. Returning to the professoriate was always a viable and often desirable option, and I did so for two years between appointments as an assistant and associate dean. With experience, I gradually became conscious of my commitment to improving teaching in SCDEs—to being a change agent. I also learned that administrative roles provided a larger palette of options from which to work; one will likely be involved with more people, more programs, budget allocations, off-campus linkages, and other exciting activities that offer possibilities for change. So I recognized that to make serious changes in colleges of education, the deanship suited me best. I convinced myself, if no one else, that I was a dean cum-change agent.

Becoming a Dean

The prospective dean should be clear why he or she wants to be a dean. The role has different attractions for different people. In my experience, the larger salary and the few perks associated with the position do not compensate for the responsibilities, worry, and extra work in the role. If the deanship is perceived to be a major opportunity to encourage, facilitate, and/or "push" innovative practices, all the other chores that come with the title are worth doing.

The title of dean, however, is only given to a person who is deemed "safe" by colleagues and other administrators. Administrators are individuals who by experience and other attributes convince others that they have the best interest at heart for their institution. This is all well and good, but what is best for an institution—how best to improve and perhaps to preserve it—is not achieved by simply meeting normal expectations for the role or by going along with the status quo. I distinguish between what one does as an administrator to fulfill institutional and collegial expectations, and what one does as a student of one's craft, of one's institution, of one's profession.

To make changes in academic institutions, one must be a student of one's profession and have a burning commitment to improve the institution. To assume a deanship without seeking to improve a college of education is to acquiesce to the most traditional and routine expectations

for deaning. Those expectations are important, of course. To survive, all deans must do them, but they are not necessarily challenging tasks. Fulfilling routine administrative responsibilities is not conducive to encouraging fresh ideas about teaching, learning, and assessment—innovative practices that ought to characterize a dynamic college of education.

"Deaning" to help an institution continue on a traditional course is a good life. It is an honorable calling if this is what a given dean—and others—want done. But if one chooses this path, one will not be a change agent. To do only what is expected, never deviating from the norm, essentially means being a bureaucrat. If one does it with a bit of flair or imagination, one could well be a popular bureaucrat, someone respected for bringing a bit of life to the academic doldrums. However, these behaviors are not the same as being a change agent.

Whatever one's style or commitments, all deans are responsible for personnel, budgetary, policy, governance, and other oversight functions. Deans are responsible to the faculty, students, staff, and central administration. They have to conscientiously serve all of these masters/constituencies if they are to succeed in the role. Deans of professional schools have a particular responsibility to the professions served by their colleges. To meet this latter expectation, they must work with a range of off-campus constituencies. Working with individuals beyond the campus involves the dean in local, state, and national activities vital to a college's well-being. In meeting these and related expectations, one's abilities and integrity are tested again and again in all of the decisions made in working with a host of individuals. Perceptions of how well the dean meets diverse expectations will vary across many constituencies.

One's actions beyond the normal expectations are what may move the dean into the role of change agent. The most critical part of being a change agent is to generate and support ideas and possibilities. The style and substance of advocacy will vary with individuals, but the basic qualities for the dean are patience, good listening skills, and a sense of humor. Whatever the dean's personality, there must be consistency between the dean's behavior and the advocacies being advanced.

Being an advocate does not mean shouting out one's beliefs, although doing so certainly feels good every now and then. It also does not mean being impatient; what one advocates may take a long time to garner support. In my experience being an advocate means going "against the grain" most of the time. Yet the advocate needs to be wise enough to recognize what others are ready to do and find ways for the group to move forward.

Encouraging fresh thinking about old problems is akin to Sisyphus' rolling the proverbial boulder up the mountain. Seldom a heady experi-

ence, it resembles trench warfare. Committee meetings are often skirmishes; allies set limits on their support; resources are the supply lines that can determine many an outcome. One engages in slow, plodding actions where one advances and retreats, dealing with situations and individuals that constantly test one's commitment and advocacies.

Hence, prospective deans had better know that they are taking on very hard work. They may be rewarded if they succeed, but they will certainly be dumped if they fail. It is not usually a win-win existence. Social change and its cousin, minor league change in academic settings, are not sure roads to success. Colleagues will often be highly and vocally divided in their willingness to participate in these efforts. These factors explain why the number of deans who are change agents is not large. Those who find one another respect and help one another. They share their frustrations and celebrate each other's accomplishments.

Should one become a dean/change agent? Allow others to make the decision for you. The Byzantine nature of academic searches and the expectations of the search committee, faculty, central administration, and others comprise a well-known mating dance. Decanal candidates have to know the steps. One approach to learning the dance is to follow the lead of those who are doing the interviewing, tuning into the expectations of the search committee, faculty, and central administration and moving in rhythm to them. This is not difficult. Most position descriptions are *deja vu* copies of others, although each institution prides itself in the belief that it needs a very particular kind of person to be *their* dean. But the dynamics, politics, and vagaries of academic life are such that it is not difficult to know what one is supposed to say and do in each "unique" college.

Prospective deans should *not* follow the lead of others step-by-step but add some fresh moves to the dance. Anyone who wants to make a difference in academe should be candid during the search process. What should be said in all possible venues is *Here is why I want to be a dean. Here is what I perceive are the problems of schools, colleges, and departments of education. Here are the things that need to be done to address these problems. Here is what I have learned thus far about this institution that leads me to believe that the potential exists for achieving these goals.* Such statements reveal the prospective dean's beliefs about the necessary steps to improve teacher education and higher education as a whole. One must make clear that working to these ends is the reason one wants to be a dean: *If you share these ideas, if you are willing to work toward them, I would like very much to have this position. If you do not share these goals, if they are contrary to where you want to go, then it is best that you not hire me. Both of us will be much happier as a result.*

Such advice is easily given. Prospective deans, however, may be much more interested in status, higher pay, a new challenge, or simply to leave their current position because anything would be better than what they have. These are not base aspirations, but they are not necessarily consistent with the dean's role as change agent. One really must consider one's true motivations. In turn, search committees and faculties must determine if their expectations and the candidate before them is a good match.

When I came to the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, I followed this advice. I had already been a dean for 9 years at Oklahoma. I had my share of successes and failures in that role. I had reached the limits of what I could do to move a college from exceptionally traditional practices to more progressive approaches to teaching and assessment[1]. Although my proposed goals were shared by only a minority of the faculty, at the same time I was working with a cadre of Oklahoma faculty, colleagues at other institutions, and key legislators to make major reforms in teacher education. It was one of my first lessons that a faculty unwilling to make change can outlast any dean—but they *must* respond after a fashion if a state mandates certain changes.

In coming to UT-Knoxville, I made clear that my single major advocacy would be serious reforms in teacher education. My agenda reflected what I believed some of the UT faculty were prepared to support. I based this assumption on individuals I met and faculty task force documents that I read during the interview process. I said that I was an advocate of a strong liberal arts preparation and that all teachers should earn a baccalaureate in arts and sciences. I argued for increased admission standards and an interview for each prospective teacher education student that involved teachers and principals. I argued for an extended program of teacher education, a 5-year program that would require a year-long internship in the schools. I indicated that the scholarly base for all of these activities was critical and that higher standards and expectations for scholarship and teaching were among my top goals. Most importantly, I said in every possible context that if these were not goals shared by the majority of the faculty, the college (and I) would be better served if I were not appointed.

I was selected and have done my best to be true to these advocacies. I am pleased that a number of significant reforms were slowly but surely supported and implemented by segments of the faculty. Little would have

[1]These perceptions are 13 years in the past and are not a commentary on Oklahoma's current college of education. There have been two new deans of the college along with changes in the composition of the faculty, so the situation I describe is is no longer the case.

been accomplished without the hard work of faculty and staff members who share these goals. But this does not mean these goals achieved unanimity or even majority support.

Every student admitted to teacher education now appears before an admissions board on which a teacher or principal is a voting member; arts and sciences majors and baccalaureate degrees are required; over 300 interns serve full-year internships in schools; over 80 teachers and principals serve as faculty associates; several professional development school agreements are in place—and the list could go on. It is because these advocacies were public, consistent, and implemented by colleagues that I remained as dean for 13 years.

However, at least one advocacy goal continues to frustrate me. I have long been an advocate of values implicit in multicultural education. My social conscience leans strongly to what in this era are castigated as liberal ideas. Civil rights, equity issues, and treating persons fairly are very important to me and in what I believe institutions must do. I long ago discovered that few academics belong to groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union, something in which I have had a lifelong membership. Higher education institutions have come a long way from the turbulent sixties when social issues finally reached the attention of mainstream academe, but these issues still receive the lip service common to academic life.

At Oklahoma and Tennessee, I did my best to help groups and individuals involved in social issues. At the same time, I have never felt that the majority of the faculty with whom I have worked at five institutions respond to these matters as strongly as I believe they should. While some legislators and political demigods attack universities for being leftist or liberal, most faculty are very careful not to get too close to controversial issues.

In my value system, whatever else one does as a change agent, if one does not address diversity on campuses and the needs of urban schools, then instructional and other changes are hollow. There is no "magic bullet" that will solve education's ills anymore than any other aspect of life. Valuing diversity and equity, however, is far more important in the long run than testing, technology and all the other educational panaceas.

Restructuring a College

In recent years, everything that I believe about change in colleges and the future of colleges of education was put to the test. Along with several key faculty leaders, I bear the responsibility for instituting a process at UT-Knoxville that has led to what is called the New College of Educa-

tion. I played a major role in beginning this process because the changes made in teacher education, while important, had not changed the ethos of the college. Fundamental assumptions and practices related to teaching, learning, and assessment were essentially the same in the new 5-year program as they were in the more traditional student teaching program. Changes were made in courses and in some practices, but a profound transformation in teaching and assessment practices is yet to come.

I believe that a college of education, in each of its programs, must demonstrate *best practice and innovative and alternative approaches to teaching*. I learned, all too slowly, that even when good things were happening in teacher education, graduate and other programs were not engaged in serious thinking about new approaches to teaching and assessment. The ethos of the college as a whole had not changed despite major shifts in teacher education. It was clear that if the college was to distinguish itself, it would need to challenge assumptions regarding its organization and practices, the fundamental characteristics of the entire enterprise: *every* program, *every* field, and *all levels* of study.

Evidence was overwhelming that in a highly traditional college, the fragmentation of knowledge and turf lines between departments were antithetical to what a dynamic institution ought to be. I had learned what many a dean had learned before me. With seven college departments, I was really the dean of eight colleges, responsible for seeking a consensus on decisions and simultaneously providing for the needs of seven departments. In effect, I was *expected* to facilitate the seven departments behaving like separate colleges yet pull things together into a veneer of one unified college of education.

The restructuring process initiated in 1991 culminated in 1994 with the university's approval to set up the new college of education. Two years of retreats, position papers, consultants, visits to exemplary programs, debates, and drafts of plans for the New College led to faculty approval of a reorganization plan for the entire college. The plan included five major college goals and a new configuration of expectations for all concerned. The seven departments were "sunsetted." In their place, 11 "units" or new configurations of faculty and programs were created in a long and complex series of personal and group negotiations. Faculty members determined which unit to join and how their programs could fit a new unit. Programs can be shared across units, thus making interdisciplinary collaboration far more of a reality. Graduate students and support staff can participate in unit decision-making.

Characterized by many ups and downs, this process was the single most important organizational transformation in the college's history.

Every faculty member had the opportunity to determine his or her professional future. Many difficult decisions were made by everyone in the college.

The process was as open as anything can be open in academic life. For a dean who initiated this process but attempted to refrain from key decisions so that the faculty ownership could evolve, this was not an easy period. Some faculty believed that I was pushing "my" plan all along, whereas, if I had done so, the changes would have been deeper. But what occurred is revolutionary within the university context. It was the most exhilarating/frustrating period I have experienced in 23 years of deaning. The level and complexity of changes were on a scale like nothing else I had experienced in my academic career.

Each unit elected a faculty member to serve as the unit leader. Much of the "administrivia" and "business" functions of the college were centralized to eliminate the redundancy across departments and give more time for the faculty, unit leaders, and administrators to work with students on scholarship and in outreach and clinical activities with colleagues in the field. Faced with the university's bureaucratic demands, many of us sought ways to simplify procedures and focus on our academic responsibilities. Many of the turf and control understandings that were more or less "settled" in the departmental structure were unraveled in this process.

It is no surprise, therefore, that some faculty members opposed the process at every turn. Indeed, two departments left the college because of their unwillingness to accept the evolving changes. But once they had determined that they did not wish to be part of the New College, I facilitated the departments' move, transferring budgets, staff, and equipment to the College of Human Ecology. No attempt was made to "skim" resources or "punish" the faculty leaving the college. Some colleagues still criticize my allowing the two departments to move.

One of the sad lessons I have learned over the years is the powerful gap between the faculty and administration. I do not think of myself as "the boss," but most of my colleagues see me this way. I make decisions and realize that this makes me "a boss." I like to believe, however, that I have listened, consulted, and weighed the views of others. Some will point to decisions that hurt their programs as I moved resources to other areas. In their view, this means a dictatorial style rather than a series of delicate negotiations resulting from endless reviews and efforts to stretch the budget. Being fair is essential to being a dean, yet this quality and goal leads to a dilemma. How can one be fair in allocating resources when serious change requires the reallocation of resources? Dealing with such choices is but another example of the difficulties of the dean and change agent in maintaining an institution and implementing reform.

Whatever my decisions or style, it is clear that how colleagues view the work of any dean is reminiscent of the tale of Roshomon: different persons perceive different events at different times in different contexts. My style, therefore, has both pros and cons attached to it as best as I can determine from what others tell me. I believe the transfer of the two departments was handled with exceptional fairness, for example, but some of the departing faculty do not share my view.

I believe I received mixed reviews because many viewed me as a change agent—a mixed blessing in a large university and a large college. The most difficult thing for me to do was to convince the opposition that the changes being made were truly designed to benefit everyone. The fundamental goal was to make the college more responsive and dynamic and thus ensure its continuity and survival. Many in academic life, however, are set in their ways and have only a limited recognition of the forces that threaten the very existence of schools, colleges, and departments of education. Change agents inevitably worry about the future more than most. The naysayers, sadly, seldom have much to offer other than their resistance to changing entrenched practices.

Challenging Assumptions

I have emphasized that being an advocate is a characteristic of change agentry. This does not mean that the ideas being advocated are unique or novel. Many of my ideas are quite conservative in their assumptions. I worry that what has been achieved is not sufficiently innovative. I read about what others are doing. I get excited by visiting other campuses with exemplary practices. I think about how various pieces of programs ought to reinforce one another. It is from these types of experiences that I gain inspiration. I also try, with little success, to communicate that I want others to bring their ideas forward.

After 35 years of academic life in five institutions, my single greatest disappointment is how few innovative ideas are aired for debate. Individuals propose minor modifications in courses or program requirements regularly, but these are minor changes. What is needed are ideas that take a hard look at the assumptions regarding how we are organized to facilitate learning in academic institutions—things that go beneath the surface—things that fall in the category of "what could be." The uses of time, the content of courses, delivery systems, different approaches to assessment—these and so many more options are intriguing. I believe strongly in seeking alternative solutions and finding more than one answer. I like ideas that challenge us and offer fresh conceptions of organization, procedures,

content and missions, etc. I simply am not comfortable with the adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," because its intent is to halt fresh thinking and ignore the many possibilities inherent in the phrase, "What if...?"

Virtually all colleges suffer from a collective case of hardening of the arteries. I see change as a way of conducting bypass surgery. The prospective dean/change agent must be willing to challenge assumptions, consider alternative solutions and programs, keep pushing for ideas though initial reactions may be negative. One will sometimes stand alone.

For whatever good or bad I have accomplished as a dean, I know I have done what I could to challenge the established order—and that is what change agentry is really all about.

DEANING IN THE NINETIES: The Challenge of Restructuring a Professional College

Nancy L. Zimpher

When I was one year into my doctoral program at Ohio State University, my major adviser suggested that I speak with the College of Education's associate dean about the possibility of my staffing its reaccreditation self-study. My adviser thought it would give me an "inside" perspective on the administration of teacher education programs. He was absolutely right. For 20 years, I have never been more than a stone's throw from the dean's office. Now I am one!

While I feel my whole professional career has been a prologue to assuming a leadership role, I was shocked to discover upon becoming a dean that I understood very little about it. Although I coauthored a major study of the deanship as a doctoral student, which I drew on in AACTE's Research About Teacher Education reports, I had a lot to learn!

My early days as dean were typified by unanticipated problems; some financial in nature, and many related to the day-to-day decision-making about faculty and student needs. I quickly learned that I was relatively unprepared to deal effectively with any of these situations at this early stage in my administrative career.

Perhaps the most telling vignette occurred my first day on the job. About 2 pm, my administrative assistant politely reminded me that I was falling behind with my "in-box." In fact, I needed to respond immediately to a request that had been placed there earlier in the day. I had thought I would get to it "in due time." I realized that you can either do the deaning—or you can do the mail, the email, the voice mail, the faxes, and so on. If you do the mail, you'll have no time to dean. I have learned to live with the consequences of regularly falling behind on the mail. While someone else can draft letters, respond to surveys, and complete reports in a timely fashion, if I as dean were to spend a disproportionate amount of time on administration and management tasks, I would miss the opportunity to lead.

Coming to the Role

During the dean search process, I was interviewed by at least a dozen different groups, all of whom had some considerable say in who would become the next dean—including faculty, school-based educators, and support staff. In the later interview, one attendee rather innocently asked, "why do you want the job?" I suspect she was really not prepared for a serious answer to such a probing question. But I quickly responded, more from the heart than the head: "...because I like to be in charge!"

The concept of being in charge is fundamentally defined contextually. While informal leadership opportunities abound, I am reflecting especially on the role of an acknowledged or designated institutional leader. Assuming some organizational legitimation, other more personal attributes contribute to the leadership equation. For me, leadership is a processing of articulating a good idea or a set of ideas, believing in them strongly, and encouraging others to embrace them; and then creating a set of strategies whereby those ideas can be expanded so that ownership for ideas and responsibility for their implementation can be assumed by others as well as by me.

In the case of my dean's staff, this is a pretty simple concept. They were, for the most part, selected because they and I share similar beliefs about what needs to be done. They take on many ideas readily and assume responsibility for them, regularly contributing to the "idea pool" themselves. Departmental chairs and faculty contribute directly to the college's energy as well, both from the perspective of all-college concerns, but also from the differential perspective of their departmental needs. Often idea generation and implementation is a process of brokering the needs of the whole and the expectations of the departments so that we continue to move generally in the same direction. Much of this chapter is about the process of negotiating an all-college agenda in the face of particularized academic unit and individual agendas. Thus the concept of "being in charge" is typically mediated by both individual and institutional interests.

I ascribe to some extent to the "new broom theory." I believe that new leadership brings opportunities for change and that more opportunities are created with change than with stability. Further, entering an entrenched organization required forceful, positive change in a particular thematic direction. I thought I knew what that direction ought to be.

Above all else, I saw my charge as that of moving the college to a new set of goals and expectations. Later I would say my goal was the "re-creation" or reinvention of the college toward a college better able to serve

the larger education profession. While this was not the language with which I began, I set forth, however awkwardly, to drive home a new vision of our college as deeply rooted in the traditions of a true "professional" college. To me, an education dean, doing so is what deaning in the '90s is all about.

My reflections are organized around three major initiatives I have led during my tenure as dean: a) restructuring the College of Education; b) extending our partnerships with local schools; and c) leading a campuswide interprofessional initiative. Hopefully there are lessons to be learned from all three short stories. They may also offer insights into deaning in the '90s—OSU style; or, more particularly, my way!

The Context

Making sense out of life in the College of Education requires an understanding of OSU. The institution serves 55,000 students at all degree levels, employs almost 20,000 faculty and staff, of which over 4,000 are tenure-track, who together live on the largest single-site university campus in the United States; a small- to medium-size city by any standard. Our distinct mission is a student-centered research university; as such, we are the only land grant institution in Ohio. We are concerned about the quality of the undergraduate experience, the reduction of crime in the adjacent neighborhoods, the quality of students, the rankings of our professional and academic programs, the capacity to attract and retain more underrepresented students and faculty to campus, and their quality of life. We try to do everything for everyone, but are striving to become a more focused institution, more responsive to our varied constituents, and more nimble in our delivery of services.

The College of Education is the sixth largest academic unit among 23 colleges on the main and regional campuses that compose OSU. We have about 135 tenure track faculty, about a third of whom are women and about 15 percent of whom are ethnic minorities. While the College of Education serves about 6 percent of the undergraduate population, we house 25 percent of the university's graduate students, and have the largest graduate enrollment of women and ethnic minorities on campus. As part of a university-wide early retirement initiative, the college lost 25 faculty, creating significant opportunities to redirect resources in the newly restructured college. Our regular general funds budget is about $17 million, and we bring in about $17.5 million in external funds, ranking fifth in the university in attracting outside support. We have existing research and development projects in over 50 countries. Most

recently, the college shifted initial teacher preparation programs to the postbaccalaureate level, wherein licensure candidates receive a Master of Education degree. We have earned top 10 rankings in the three national reputation studies published in *U.S. News and World Report*.

To Restructure or Not to Restructure

Given these strengths, why would restructuring be necessary? There are several reasons: not enough money to sustain the quality we have attained; not enough focus on programmatic priorities; and a president committed to reform. I took the deanship because I, too, was committed specifically to teacher education reform. Ohio State's president, in fact, had asked me in my hiring interview to shake the place up a bit. He made it very clear that he expected visible, substantive changes.

We discussed his interest in the reorganization of the college. At that time, I cautiously observed that to reorganize a college that had been reorganized rather cumbersomely several times in the past 15 years was not what I wanted to do. As a matter of principle, I would not want to assume a leadership role in any organization and commence immediately with "reorganization" per se. Still, I had my own reasons for "shake and bake," related largely to a sense of the college's failed mission and the erosion over time of its distinctive focus. Hence, my agreement with the president's request to reorganize evolved, but for different reasons.

I knew this college's strengths and shortcomings well. Clearly, nationally recognized faculty and high ranking programs were a plus. At the time I assumed the deanship, the college offered certification programs in 67 teaching areas, with 108 discrete program formats, and over 1,000 course offerings, all housed in an array of 30 formal program areas. We had too many low enrollment courses, and an anemic outreach and continuing education effort; too many students scoring too low on the GRE; rampant course and program redundancies; a general funds budget that had been slashed by 15 percent over the past 5 years; significant program area gaps; and a graying cohort of faculty. Although these problems were common at many large state universities, I believed the situation was further complicated by a college that had lost sight of its mission as a professional college.

In my first major address to the faculty, only 6 months into my tenure as dean, I reviewed the collective perspectives of several scholars on the status of American teacher education (Goodlad, 1990; Judge, 1982; Smith, 1980; and Clifford & Guthrie, 1989). We, like other preeminent research oriented ed schools, had "...tuned in to the values and habits of

the graduate schools of the arts and sciences, especially the social sciences" (Judge, p. 29). We were, in my opinion, preciously close to achieving this chilling admonition:

> To the extent that schools of education downplay their role in the preparation of teachers and overplay their image as behavioral science research centers, they run the risk of undermining their rightful claim to professional unit status within the multiversity community. This is no small threat, even for the prestigious "ed schools" in major research universities (Soder & Sirotnik in Goodlad, 1990, p.401).

Thus, I set out as dean to lead a college into the 21st century through the revival of its professional college mission, attempting to achieve conditions that typify professional colleges—i.e., strong commitments to the profession and practice, school-based partnerships, inquiry, laboratory and clinical practice, and a sensitivity to the changing cultural dynamics in American society as reflected in classrooms and other educational organizations and agencies served by the college. While this seemed an obvious direction to me, I was prepared for and met some resistance to this vision.

First, there were a number of faculty who did not see themselves as connected to the traditional preparation of professionals who work in schools. For some, this concern was expressed in differentiations between foundational and applied knowledge, or basic research versus research more informed by practice. For them, I had to underscore the importance of theoretical knowledge and its relation to practice.

Second, in programs such as exercise science, higher education administration, and adult education, this agenda wasn't "speaking" to them. While I never compromised the professional (read: schooling) agenda, I tried to adopt a language pattern that advocated a seamless system of education (to incorporate colleagues in higher education), a lifelong learning system (to respond to adult educators), and education at off-campus sites (to accommodate faculty who serve in agencies, parks, hospitals, and hostels). I worry that these multiple foci diffuse a collegewide focus, but because of the strong contributions of these disciplines to our college, I dared not suggest a college configuration that failed to incorporate their interests. Thus, with an amended view of "professionalization," constructed to keep everyone more or less on board, restructuring was launched.

The Event

It seemed to me that the college was waiting for an agenda. During the search process, I had used my speeches to lay out the context for change, relating forces at the local, state, and national levels. While I did exhort at the general level, I wasn't asking anybody to do anything yet; I was "just talking." But then it began, through a series of forums and sessions, projects and papers. The result: 4 years later, a college well on its way to becoming a fully restructured entity.

Engaging the college in a massive dialogue on pressing social and educational issues seemed to me to be possible and desirable. While a modest number of individuals beyond the faculty were involved, the central strategy was to engage the faculty in one inclusive, group problem-solving endeavor. Our restructuring process occurred in a series of phases, with the closing scenes just recently completed.

Phase I of the restructuring process was launched during the spring quarter of 1993, convening a series of "Friday Forums" around a set of topics related to the contextual issues I had raised during the dean search, including the professional preparation of educators, research and development, outreach, our instructional contexts, international initiatives, lifelong learning, diversity, and the quality of the student experience. To make the forums more than protracted debating societies, we divided up into working groups and asked that each group develop an "action paper" summarizing its discussions. I began to see that the dean's staff could not, and should not, orchestrate this process alone. So we began to engage the college's Faculty Senate in the process, honoring a more collegial leadership format.

In early October 1993, we launched a full-scale agenda, "Creating the New Professional College of Education." I gave the only hour-long speech of my 5-year term, complete with overhead transparencies, posters, and citations. When it was all over, I charged the college to go to work under the auspices of the senate.

In Phase II, we created "design teams" charged to debate and make recommendations around ensuring quality preparation for educators, creating programs of research that emanate from and inform practice, improving faculty capacity as exemplars of professional practice, formulating collaborative networks, and addressing the implications of a more diverse national demography.

By November, the new provost issued the directive: all colleges must engage in developing a plan for restructuring their academic and administrative enterprise, with a budget target of reallocating possible intervals of

3 percent, 5 percent, or 7 percent of their resources. The conditions were clearly stated by the provost: "...lack of active participation risked the return of reallocated resources to the central administration."

After several all-college meetings to sense the will of the faculty, Phase II culminated in February 1994, with a unanimous senate vote to support the college's "Restructuring Plan" in principle. Once the real strategies for restructuring were determined, the full faculty would be polled. With only 4 months to get the plan together, more discussion was warranted before an all-faculty vote could occur.

The plan was described in a 50-page restructuring document that was drafted by committee, circulated widely to the faculty, and edited by the Faculty Senate. It includes a vision statement and a set of core values that define the essence of a professional college, reflected in many of the topical categories already described. The plan called for the consolidation of four departments and a school into three new departments (dropping two administrative units) and proposed the consolidation and new affiliation of our 30 distinct program areas (previously distributed across the five units) into a trimmed-down, newly formed 11 program areas, to be distributed across the three new administrative units. A matrix organization would be created to make more fluid the arbitrary political and programmatic lines created by departments "on the vertical," cross-tabulated with horizontal informal groupings to work on common college agendas. That is, while departmental units would operate as parallel and discrete structures ("columns"), more effective ways were needed to address common concerns across these structures ("rows").

Finally, we committed ourselves to the implementation of five innovative "big ideas," including the creation of a campus academic learning center, an urban professional development academy, and a pre-education minor. No one ever asked where these ideas came from. I just talked about them, encouraged people to look with pride on a college that was on the "cutting edge"—where a first-rate college of education should be in a first-rate university. That, I believe, carried the day.

Phase III of the restructuring process spanned spring '94 through spring '95. During this period, newly formulated program areas began in earnest to rewrite curriculum proposals, and work together on staff and design issues. The senate's curriculum committee gave them a protocol to respond to, and faculty were advised that new programs must be in place by fall 1996.

Phase IV began in spring '95, with a transition team charged by the senate to provide guidelines for moving us into our new structure. All 11 program areas have been extensively reviewed by the Faculty Senate and

are operating, the three new departments have been established and have selected their new directors, created staffing priorities, and are currently developing bylaws, "patterns of administration," and new tenure and promotion guidelines. Our final restructuring proposal, approved by a faculty vote of 90 to 18, took 14 months to move through two campuswide committees and the University Senate, and was forwarded to the university's board of trustees for final approval on June 6, 1996.

Throughout the process of restructuring, I was never out of the loop. The senate chair and I co-convened every meeting. When we lost focus, or when an interpretation of actions taken by central administration was needed, I stepped in. I didn't have to fight for the microphone; it was collegially offered. I constantly restated the goal: the professionalization of the college. And I cautioned always about the necessity of moving forward, so much so at the culminating meeting of the Faculty Senate in June 1995, at the end of another year of the process, I was presented with two framed posters designed by NIKE. They say, one in braille and one in sign language— "Just do it!"

The Critique

I really didn't intend to begin my tenure as dean with a reorganization agenda. I was partially forced to do so by the larger university initiative. Both the president and the provost were counting the number of departments downsized or dropped during this restructuring initiative. They published a newsletter which was intended to display the "effects" of the process in the light of reduced numbers of departments. There simply was not a possibility that we would submit a plan without reflecting a reduction in the number of departments.

I was not opposed to making structural changes in the college; I think they were desperately needed. Rather, I was concerned that structural considerations, which are almost always political in nature, would detract from the substantive nature of the changes needed. Further, I am concerned as are others on campus that structural reform may in the final analysis cost a lot more than is gained in apparent saved resources and streamlined efficiencies.

There were other negative claims. Some faculty who saw the departments as too large and dysfunctional said they were disenfranchised by the senate and had not been faithfully represented in the debate. Further, we simply could not as a collective really decide to drop anything. Instead we consolidated and affiliated. We continue to be faced with deciding what we aren't going to do. The faculty simply can't cut

anything, and especially one and two member program areas. A recent debate about new positions ultimately dissolved into a situation wherein program areas made recommendations, albeit in a more public forum than ever before; but in the end, the dean's office set the final priorities.

There were other flank actions throughout this process that complicated things considerably. There appeared to be some interest in the provost's office toward shifting the structure of the college of social work. At about the same time, the school of public policy and management was unhappy with its home in the college of business and wanted to relocate. So our college expressed interest in these issues, along with responding to the provost's announced interest in building a center for social affairs and public policy through an interdisciplinary, all-university structure. Our college decided to play to these opportunities. Thus we included in our restructuring plan the possibility of incorporating these two units (social work and public policy and management) into a configuration that might eventually be called something like the "college of education and public affairs."

We had numerous meetings, with over 100 faculty in attendance at all times. We logged thousands of hours of discussion toward this process, focusing on changes at the program area level, forming new departmental structures, and stimulating several horizontal, cross-departmental issues. At the first fall 1995 faculty meeting—a 2-day governance extravaganza—only one faculty member was absent.

While there is considerable support for what has happened, there is undoubtedly some cynicism. The college's proposed collaborations with the College of Social Work and the School of Public Policy and Management fell through. Social work was granted its wish to remain independent, and public policy and management finally affiliated with another college. During an open forum on the restructuring process, some students stated they had not been adequately involved and several staff members complained about the uncertainties associated with restructuring the administrative units. Since that time, we have increased our communications efforts with both students and staff, and worked diligently to involve them further in the college's governance structure.

People also can tire of the collective agenda and would like to be left alone to run their programs and continue their academic work. For some, the agenda is clearly bent too much toward teacher education to adequately represent other affiliated interests. And surely there are others who think "this too shall pass." I agree with them. But something else will take its place.

Building Partnerships with the Field

The restructuring agenda is about the most introverted activity engaged in by a college. While restructuring has the long-term payoff for clients and constituents of better programs and more articulated course offerings, it does little directly to extend the work of the college to the profession. So this next story is about "reaching out."

Years before becoming dean, I was director of student teaching and field placements for the college of education for 8 years. Ted Cyphert appointed me to this administrative position just prior to completing my Ph.D. I took the position for several reasons: first, I was at the time, place-bound; second, I believed that I could quickly convince faculty to convert the position to an assistant professorship (a dumb idea since it took 8 years); and third, since my doctoral major had been teacher education, I was deeply committed to the role's clinical aspects.

Serving in this office gave me a marvelous opportunity to get to know field practitioners. I managed the "exchange of services agreement" we have had for 30 years with the school districts in Franklin County, which creates reciprocal opportunities for field placements and continuing professional development. I was the college's liaison with two powerful professional organizations: the superintendent's group, the Franklin County Area Administrators, and the union leaders' group, the Franklin County Council of Education Associations. I became a double recipient of the teacher union's "friend of education" award, and developed helpful relationships with most of the superintendents.

So, when the college decided to join the Holmes Group in 1987, and subsequently proceeded to transform its initial teacher education programs into a postbaccalaureate Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree, I could see the opportunity to build better relationships with the field. While I had left the field director role in 1982 and the dean's staff in 1986 as I ascended the tenure and promotion ladder, I continued to assist the dean's office in field relations. Thus begins the story of "partnership building."

The Event

While joining the Holmes Group led to the creation of a postbaccalaureate teacher preparation program, I became concerned that the college had left the clinical aspects of the programs underdeveloped. The protocol for M.Ed. development had a clear mandate for field internships, yet no clear elements of the plan had been laid out, nor had we begun to live up to the Holmes Group's commitment to professional development schools (PDSes).

This gap presented a special opportunity for me. Intrigued by the PDS idea, I went to the dean to propose a strategy, got the go-ahead to draft something for review, and proceeded to draw a map and timeline for full-scale adoption of the PDS notion. I proposed a year-long strategy for convening committees to define the PDS and the role of clinical educators; create a "call for participation" for joint college-school proposals for the creation of PDSes; and design a governance structure, an agenda for inquiry, and a resource plan.

The strategy called for many meetings, public hearings, document development, and a timeline for implementation of a first round of PDSes by the following year. I delivered the draft to the dean, turned the whole operation over to the dean's staff, and stepped back to watch. When the initial round of meetings appeared to lack momentum, I proposed to the dean that I manage the plan for him. He accepted, and one year later we were well on our way to implementing the PDS agenda. For me it was a simple matter of creating a plan and sticking to it. With the full imprimatur of the dean, this couldn't fail. And it didn't.

We proceeded to solicit two rounds of the "call for participation." We defined a series of scenarios that allowed for alternative conceptions of the PDS (from single-site PDSes, to networks, to enabling projects) of which we now have a dozen fairly well-rooted PDS initiatives. We also developed the concept of clinical educators, and advertised positions in participating school districts, such that today we fund 21 clinical educators and field professors. We created a PDS Policy Board, composed of faculty and field representatives, and have nearly institutionalized this concept. As the dean's designee, I called the meetings, led the discussions, assigned work to committees, wrote or reviewed drafts, "worked" the field by attending regular meetings of the superintendents and union leaders, and generally saw to it that things got done.

This is the way I became a dean, first through a half-time associate deanship to run the PDS initiative, then a full-time associate deanship to run the college's program office. I have carried my very clear commitment to PDSes through to the dean's office. I now allocate over $250,000 of discretionary resources to this initiative—a quarter of all of my annual discretionary money. While I have relinquished most of my direct oversight of the project to my associate dean for program, I intend to continue to commit resources to maintain this high-priority effort.

But I believed the real partnership work still lacked definition. We needed an institutional connection between the college and the major urban school district that would allow us to systematically reduce the barriers that inhibit most partnership relations—cultural clashes, lack of

resources, conflicting working conditions, weak incentives, and the absence of consistent leadership. We also needed a comprehensive change strategy which could effect innovative practice across the entire school district and the college of education. We needed a vehicle for three headstrong leaders (a dean, a superintendent, and a union leader) to subjugate their individual interests for the greater good.

Through all these travails, we managed to create, jointly, a very powerful proposal for an "Urban Academy for Professional Development and School Renewal," a project of the Columbus Public Schools administration, the Columbus Education Association (the union), and the college of education. In fall 1996, we initiated the five-site, $30-million plan at two elementary school sites and an on-campus site, to be followed by the eventual opening of a middle and high school site. Through hours and hours of commitment on the part of a small group of university and school faculty, teachers, and principals, I believe we have begun to convince this complex and challenged urban school district that we are serious about our commitment. Now if we can only convince the broader faculty and participating school district personnel, the board, and the larger community!

Beyond this important local initiative, I have become deeply involved in a critical statewide partnership initiative that is opening all kinds of doors to numerous external constituents. Through the wisdom of our former chief state school officer, and a powerful spokesperson in the Ohio Business Roundtable, Ohio set out to create a one-of-a-kind coalition of educational, business, and community groups to build public support for P-12 education in Ohio. This comprehensive consortium is composed of the heads of every significant education organization in the state, including the public and private deans groups, the heads of the Ohio Business Roundtable and the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, and over 20 corporate members. Called Ohio's BEST (Building Excellence in Schools for Today and the 21st Century), this coalition initially invited Ohio State's president to the table. In his stead, I have become the only higher education representative on the steering committee of this 62-member organization, and have considerable access in building this coalition's agenda.

I also became active in the Holmes Group. As a relatively new board member, I was chosen to serve on a "futures committee," charged to redefine the nature and scope of the Holmes Group. During 1995, the futures committee met almost monthly to write a proposal for the Holmes Board that changed the focus of the group to the Holmes Partnership, expanded the Holmes Board to include local and national professional partners, redefined contemporary SCDEs as only those in

deep partnership with the field, and situated the new membership as the research and development arm of the profession. This has been an excruciatingly time-consuming effort, and it is far from over. Now I chair the board of directors for the newly created Holmes Partnership and am president of the organization. Last year, I was in every region of the country speaking in behalf of the "new Holmes," and exhorting, inviting, cajoling continuing and expanded membership. I am doing so because I truly believe a unified profession is the only real vehicle for improving teacher education and continuing professional development, and as a consequence, school reform. I think the Holmes Partnership may be a very effective vehicle to foster this agenda, and while not the only viable approach, it's certainly one that might work. While much remains to be done, the organization did in fact transform itself and has begun to function in the new partnership arrangement. Only another decade worth of action and analysis will determine the effects of this transformation.

The Critique

I believe profoundly in the collaborative nature of the field. I'm a product of the federal Teacher Center movement, and I truly believe that the kind of parity and teacher control embedded in that legislation is still our national imperative. For as many years as I can remember, I have had almost a spiritual understanding of the kind of professional unity needed in transforming the profession. For me, when teacher education and teacher development are the issue, three voices must be heard: school administrators, schoolteachers, and teacher educators. That's what makes the PDS movement profound, and what makes necessary the kind of local collaboration Ohio State has with the school districts in Franklin County. This kind of collaboration makes critical the college's role in the statewide BEST initiative and recognizes the promise of the Holmes Partnership.

I am one of a growing number of voices in this direction. Clearly the "new unionism" espoused by the National Education Association, and the innovative reforms championed by the American Federation of Teachers reflect this commitment. A number of these educational organizations have joined ranks with the Holmes Partnership and are committing themselves to other important coalitions. Still, keeping the focus of these partnerships on strategic outcomes that will truly enhance teaching and learning is the major challenge.

And no matter how right-minded the nature of this agenda, I am probably spread too thin. I need to do a better job of broadening the base of support for collaboration in my college. Everyone else knows that

this is where I stand. But who stands with me, and who will follow after me? I'm getting a better idea of that now, and can proudly point to many pockets of deep commitment and engagement across the college. And of course there's the remote possibility that I'm wrong about the need for partnerships. I suppose higher education could lose its identity, sacrifice what it has achieved in knowledge generation, or relinquish its claim as the training arm of the profession. But we'll probably only be able to see this clearly a decade or two from now.

While I've tried to weave together three important strands of activity that illustrate a professional college's commitment to schools and professional organization partnerships, I would like to revisit my leadership role in all this. First, I believe others perceive my commitment to practitioners and are aware of my work relative to the importance of partnerships. In numerous local, state, and national organizational leadership roles, I have advocated for teacher professional development as the crucial key to school renewal, including efforts related to the Ohio affiliate of AACTE, state coalitions such as BEST, and surely in my work with the Holmes Partnership. More recently, I served as cochair of a commission charged by the state superintendent and the chancellor of the board of regents to create more articulation between the K-12 and higher education sectors. Thus, my leadership in these arenas has enabled others in the college to make connections to important policy agendas which I think the faculty perceive as helpful and supportive of their individual policy work.

Within the larger university community, I continue to be called upon to assist in the outreach and engagement opportunities identified at the all-university level. Linkages with the local community, including urban schools, the chamber, certain service organizations, and the United Way are all critical to effective partnerships by both a professional college of education and a university poised to assert its interest in university collaboratives. Not only do I view these connections as important; I enjoy them immensely and learn a great deal from my participation.

A Case for Interprofessional Development

Given my strong commitment to linking field-based initiatives with colleges of education, I also see the limits in capacity of any single profession to resolve the major dilemmas that face our society. For many years, I have heard the rhetoric of interprofessionalism and have experience with the eroding of such an effort.

A support base among the deans of five Ohio State colleges was diluted by several provosts who withheld funds previously allocated for an

interpro-fessional initiative. In 1992, the Office of Academic Affairs withdrew all central support for the Interprofessional Commission of Ohio, despite the facts that our program is recognized as a prototype and OSU was a founder of a national interprofessional organization.

The Event

This is where I came in as dean. I set about discovering why the deans of the five founding colleges no longer supported the commission. With the lack of provostial support, they had lost confidence in the agenda. I asked them for permission to resuscitate the effort; they agreed that if I would work on it, they would attend meetings and support the reframing of the interprofessional agenda.

I invited 16 academic units to a roundtable series of breakfast discussions. Enthusiasm began to build. It was clear after about a year's worth of discussions, which I chaired, that we were ready to "do" something.

And then one day the president introduced the new director of a joint project, "Campus Partners," among Ohio State, the city of Columbus, and its adjacent community to revitalize the university neighborhoods which were so plagued by crime and deteriorated that 3,000 students had moved out and headed for the suburbs.

There it was, the golden opportunity the interprofessional group had been waiting for. Since that time, the number of academic and support units around the table has expanded considerably, bringing along over 42 member groups, convening faculty, staff, and students for a series of task forces, and moving academic units to commit over $300,000 annually to operate the initiative. While the provost initially allocated $100,000 in seed grants related to our effort, the university has now committed $100,000 annually toward the operation of our "Campus Collaborative."

This interdisciplinary effort is one of the few initiatives on campus enlisting such a wide array of academic and support units and having materialized without a provost or president's initial action. It is one of the few interdisciplinary efforts that reflects a commitment to outreach and extension. So this grassroots model of engagement is a powerful exemplar for our university's recently formed Outreach and Engagement Council.

Success is an absolute imperative to the colleges involved. The university president has made this his top priority, as has the vice president for student affairs, and the mayor sees the partnership with the university as a "one-of-a-kind" demonstration that the town-gown thing can work. This is just the kind of project I like. Yet the task is daunting, given so many difficult social issues involved in reasserting the neighborhoods. But it is exciting, challenging, and vital.

The Critique

I tend to gravitate to cross-college initiatives where strange bedfellows are united. It entertains me to go against the grain and the natural proclivity of the university to stay in the silos! Also, I like right-minded causes, and as long as I don't put the college of education's interests above those of the other collaborating colleges, other deans seem willing to let me assume a leadership role in this and other initiatives across campus.

The travails, though, seem on some days endless. Creating ownership of a presidentially-initiated agenda is always a challenge. Thus the presence of a group of deans already committed to an interprofessional agenda was a plus. In a rather unprecedented move, the Board of Trustees committed endowment funds to this revitalization project, reflecting its very considerable collective will to positively effect neighborhood conditions. And finally, adjusting the incentives system such that individual participation is rewarded continues to be a central challenge of this and other initiatives.

These issues put me and the college right in the middle. It's the right place to be, but I have had to consider with my senior leadership staff the implications of continuing to lead this initiative at the risk of jeopardizing other major efforts in the college. It is the leadership problem of getting too far out in front of faculty and/or the consequence of the middle-management role of deans.

What Works; What Doesn't

The deans in the UNITE project set out to become more self-critical about their work and to better articulate what works and what doesn't within the realm of changing and reforming ed schools. We thought that by sharing with each other, we would learn more about ourselves and each other. This has certainly proven to be the case for me. I think I can now fairly well articulate my role as a leader and change agent, taking into account my strengths and weaknesses.

I had an agenda as dean. I felt I knew what the college needed, based on my experience with other colleges. I know that colleges of education are not adequately serving the profession they were created to support. That is a singular problem, and I believe should be the priority agenda for all schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States.

I am not afraid to articulate this agenda within ed schools and have written on it extensively. I am dismayed by the absence of adequate state policy enabling ed schools to contribute more directly to school reform, although Ohio is making progress in this regard. While historically

teacher education has not typically been a high priority in the federal sector, several promising signs reflect changes in that posture. Further, universities have been hesitant to recognize the real power in the P-16 agenda, and the crucial role ed schools could play in a reconciliation of the "whole" educational system. Profound prejudices against ed schools continue to be apparent in many quarters, and I have to believe in some cases are still regrettably deserved. Still and all, I think improving P-16 education should be an all-university agenda, and I continue to frame the college's leadership agenda from that perspective.

If a dean has a clearly defined change agenda, then he or she should regularly articulate it to appropriate audiences, staff the college accordingly, and allocate resources to underwrite its success. That's my strategy: be explicit about direction, allocate resources to get there; keep the heat on. Although the agenda will take 10+ years and my term is 5 years, I decided early in the process to avoid the notion that I need to get re-elected or reappointed. I should do what I have to do. If done with care, style, and élan, the dean will be there to carry on. I have to believe that or I couldn't function effectively.

If I believe that my ideas about what the college symbolizes should inform and at times, guide (drive) the process, then I have to create vehicles to make that happen. My leadership style as a change agent is deeply connected to sustained dialogue, debate, and joint action. I ask people to put ideas and strategies in writing. We revisit these texts regularly but don't redo or balk at a step once taken. I am faithful to what the organization has decided and try to reuse the terms in the documents so people will continue to recognize their presence in the process. There needs to be broad and continuing engagement in construction and implementation of the agenda, so changes can be personally meaningful for those involved.

Leadership is ultimately intuitive. I have to be personable and approachable. While my calendar is a nightmare, anybody can and does contact me by email. I'm constantly aiming for a 24-hour response mode, so people get more of what they want to know sooner. I send notes of acknowledgment for small and great accomplishments, and try generally to greet people genuinely as I see them on a daily basis. I suppose I have my detractors, but I don't dwell on it or even worry much about who they might be. We continue to work toward organizational efficiencies, a "quality" approach to constituents and services, and a more data-based decision-making process.

Since a college operates within the larger university environment, I have used the university's agenda to leverage actions in my college. Here's an

adage: If you want to change something, hope for a budget crisis! Ohio State has had plenty of them and nothing seems to motivate us like the fear of more cuts. The other thing that helps internally is to have some institutional capital as dean. My role as a coordinating dean (called "executive dean") of a cluster of professional colleges provides access to venues for central administration decision-making. There really is no substitute for good citizenship on campus, and I believe we have a good start as a college of acting, if you will, for the good of the order.

The college community generally approves of the changes we've made. The Faculty Senate usually votes unanimously when it votes. Within the college, we get positive votes from the majority, with about 18 to 20 opposing. I've come to believe it's not the same 18 to 20 people, but rather the maxim of "you can please all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but never all of the people all of the time." I have created two staff advisory committees and a Student Leadership Council to more carefully integrate each group's concerns into college decisions.

I believe the exercise of these strategies, coupled with my personal style of leadership and strong beliefs about the future of ed schools, comprise who I am as a dean. I have regrets, I've made mistakes, but I really wouldn't change things much. But I'm tired! I think we all have to find a way to lead and learn, reach and rest, to keep going and stay renewed ourselves. I'm working on that.

References

Clifford, G. J. & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed School: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds). (1990). *Places where teachers are taught*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad*. New York: Ford Foundation.

Smith, B.O., Silverman, S.H., Borg, J.M. & Fry, B.V. (1980). *A design for a school of pedagogy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (1990). Beyond reinventing the past: The politics of teacher education. In Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds). *Places where teachers are taught* (pp. 385–409). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

NEW VALUES & NEW PROGRAMS: One Dean's Experience

Raphael O. Nystrand

I became dean of the School of Education at the University of Louisville (U of L) in December 1978. Now in my 17th year at the same institution, I have had the opportunity to work on an agenda over time. This chapter describes the introduction of two major changes in our school during this period. They have been in process for several years, are complementary to one another, and are not fully implemented at the time of this writing. The first reflects a shift in the nature of our working relationships with local P-12 schools. The second involves the elimination of our undergraduate teacher education programs (except in vocational education) in favor of a field-based, professional year program. Although many people participated in their design and implementation, the perspective in the following pages will be largely autobiographical because this is a book about the role of deans in bringing about change.

Working with K-12 Schools

U of L has had a long history of "working with schools." Indeed this tradition was an important factor in my deciding to come to Louisville. I was especially impressed with two existing arrangements. The first was an "Educational Park" agreement which joined the university with neighboring primary, middle, and secondary schools to share facilities and do some joint programming. The second was the Jefferson County Educational Consortium which joined the school district, the University of Louisville, and the University of Kentucky in a mutual effort to attract funds for research and professional development. I soon learned, however, that these arrangements were begun with the old Louisville City School District. The subsequent merger of this district with the surrounding Jefferson County Schools and the simultaneous court-ordered desegregation of the district created a new agenda for the schools which overshadowed interest in cooperative programs with the university.

Even as merger and desegregation were taking place, our faculty members were involved with their public school counterparts in mostly

traditional ways. Faculty members typically viewed the schools as sites to place their students for field experiences and student teaching, do their research and inservice presentations, or conduct other service projects for the schools. Like many other university faculties, we viewed the schools as important places for our students to gain experience, but we saw relatively little benefit (in terms of intellectual development or professional advancement) to our being there.

Over the past decade or so, this view has changed. We now see schools and their faculty members as essential partners in our own professional development, collaborative research, and teacher preparation. The principles that guide these relationships are those of parity and mutual support. Together we recognize that school and university personnel have different priorities, work assignments, and professional strengths. We also believe that we can improve both schools and universities by working together. It is this change in mindset and the corresponding redesign of our teacher education programs that will be explained in the following pages.

The University & the School of Education

The University of Louisville is an urban/metropolitan school of approximately 22,000 students. Most of our students are commuters (fewer than 2,500 reside in dormitories), and many attend on a part-time basis. Less than 30 percent of entering freshmen graduate within 5 years; it is not unusual for students to work 8 or 9 years toward an undergraduate degree. While we admit approximately 1500 freshman directly from high school each year, we also enroll many community college transfers and other adults returning from the work force or otherwise seeking a change in their lives. The average age of our undergraduates is 27+. The diverse nature of our student population is underscored at commencement where it is not unusual for me to award bachelor's degrees to a student and his or her parent on the same day. The School of Education was established in 1968 when 14 founding faculty members surrendered their status as a department in the College of Arts and Sciences.

When I arrived at the school as its second dean in 1978, there were approximately 50 faculty members working with 1,800 students. Approximately two-thirds of the students were graduate students, most of whom were employed by local schools and attending the university part time to renew certificates or obtain credits that would advance them on their salary schedule. The beginning teacher preparation program was field-based in that students were expected to spend considerable time in

observations and pre-student teaching activities during their sophomore and junior years. However, faculty members spent relatively little time in schools except to visit student teachers.

Today our school has approximately 80 faculty members who work with about 2,000 students. Approximately three-fourths of these are graduate students, 20 per cent of whom are enrolled in doctoral programs that did not exist in 1978.

Establishing the Context for Change

When I accepted the deanship, I was impressed with the overall quality of the faculty, but felt they were dispirited. Their tone was reflected by the initial question asked of me by the search committee: "How do you feel about dealing with conflict?" I came to learn that they were fighting with the president about low salaries and poor facilities (at that time, the school was housed in six buildings including three post-World War II barracks.) They also saw themselves as lacking status compared to other public universities in the state. One reason for this perception was that each of these other institutions was currently teaching extension courses in education in area school buildings. The faculty expected their new dean to wrest additional resources from the president (a new building had already been promised) and establish the hegemony of the school of education in the Louisville-Jefferson County area.

My first agenda was to recognize and build upon the quality I saw in our faculty, heal the rift between our school and the central administration, and establish a reputation of strength and responsiveness for the school. Initially, my energies were focused upon developing a proposal to offer doctoral programs that would win approval of our faculty, the university administration, and the Kentucky Council on Higher Education (CHE). At that time, only the University of Kentucky was authorized to grant the doctorate in education in our state. However, because U of L had been recognized as the state's urban institution by the CHE, there was some recognition that education would be an appropriate field for advanced study at U of L. Some faculty members had developed a proposal but had failed to gain a majority of faculty support.

I saw CHE approval of doctoral programs for us as a way of achieving several goals. It would give our faculty a common project to work for and take pride in, win support of the central administration for our school, and enhance the status of our school in the state. I also thought that the opportunity to work with doctoral students would be an important incentive in recruiting future faculty members.

Development and approval of this new program was my top priority for my first 2 years at U of L. I took full advantage of my "honeymoon" as dean to gain faculty support for a proposal that would offer the degree in five areas and had potential to involve almost every professor who wished to participate. Working with a group of faculty members who had expressed interest in doctoral programs, we shaped our proposal and met with others to gain support from the graduate school faculty and the faculty senate. The politics of gaining final approval at the state level were lengthy and complicated. I sought and gained the support of the CHE staff, the chief state school officer, area school personnel, our local newspapers, and a few lay members of the CHE board. Together they lobbied others on our behalf, and we were authorized to begin offering doctoral programs in 1981-82.

If gaining approval for doctoral programs was my top "product" objective in the early years of my deanship, I was equally interested in the "process" objective of strengthening our school's relationships with area teachers and administrators. The Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) were fresh from a well-publicized desegregation battle and an internally divisive merger with the city district. Local business leaders were extremely critical of the then-superintendent and the district's management practices. Largely as a result of these developments, most people in our school had very limited contact with the JCPS and the surrounding (and much smaller) county school districts. However, an associate dean in our school had been superintendent in one of the latter districts and was eager to help us work with them.

I spent considerable time establishing relationships with school districts and trying to find a way to say "yes" to their concerns. With the help of the associate dean, we established a consortium of the districts surrounding Jefferson County. This group, the Ohio Valley Education Consortium (OVEC), provides for cooperative purchasing, professional development, and support services across these districts. Our school provided them with office staff and staff support until they could function independently. The same associate dean helped me establish the Kentucky Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) with the state administrator's association. This was an invitational professional development activity for 30 to 35 administrators per year. Our objective was to reach beyond our metropolitan area and develop identity with leaders in other parts of the state. Closer to home, I chaired (on a pro bono basis) the consultant team that recruited a new superintendent of schools to Jefferson County in 1981.

The new superintendent of schools came from Orange County, California. His board and other leaders in the community wanted him to

build public confidence in the system. Because he was eager to have the support of the university in this endeavor, we soon established a very positive working relationship. At about the same time, the university recruited a new president who was enthusiastic about the urban mission of U of L and saw working with the schools as an essential element of this mission. He became a strong supporter of the school of education. The relationship that I was able to establish with these two leaders was very beneficial to the School of Education.

I also networked with professional organizations and business leaders in support of school reform at local and state levels. When the new superintendent asked me to cochair a committee that would revise the local desegregation plan, I agreed to do so knowing full well that this would be a controversial activity.

In fall 1984, the newly elected governor of Kentucky asked if I would join her cabinet as Secretary of Education and Humanities. I had never sought nor imagined myself in this position. However, after discussing the possibility with the university president, I took a leave of absence from the deanship and served as secretary for one year. I subsequently learned that some of my earlier networking activity led to this invitation. More important, my time in this post helped me to establish relationships that would assist with the school of education's change initiatives.

The single most important factor was our recruitment of new faculty members who were enthusiastic about working with schools. Possessing good ideas, high energy, and strong interpersonal skills, they soon established strong rapport with area teachers and administrators. Together with some more senior faculty who were already active in local schools, they constituted the critical mass of talent that would provide leadership in rethinking our relationships with school-based colleagues. Several of them have gained national recognition for the quality of their work in this area. This core group of faculty members has also been instrumental in searching for new faculty members. As a consequence, virtually every person added to our teacher education faculty since the early 1980s has been recruited in part because of their enthusiasm for and potential effectiveness in school-based collaboration.

I found that there were several things that I, as dean, could do to support and encourage the innovative work of these faculty members. Most importantly, I tried to find a way to say "yes" to their ideas for working with schools. Sometimes this took the form of providing verbal support; identifying a like-minded school or university colleague; or supplying secretarial assistance, travel money, or other financial support. For example, I supported such proposals as job-sharing with a primary school teacher, teaching a

reading practicum in a community center, developing a sequence of action research courses as an alternative to a core in an M.Ed. program, and allocating faculty time and load credit to many school-based projects. Sometimes I provided the initial contact between school or community people and a faculty member. One such meeting between a local arts group and a faculty member led to the formation of the Kentucky Institute for Arts Education.

I also tried to highlight those who took such initiative. We would include stories about them in the school newsletter and arrange for the local paper to write feature stories about their efforts. I encouraged our department chairpersons to recognize such work when making their recommendations for merit-based salary increases. Perhaps the strongest message was sent in a promotion review for one of the newer faculty members who had been very active in the schools. Although her promotion materials included evidence of good teaching, several solid publications based upon work in schools, and evidence of grants acquisition, she received a negative recommendation from her departmental colleagues. The crux of their opposition was that she spent too much time in schools and therefore neglected important departmental priorities. However, the department chairperson endorsed her promotion, and I wrote a supportive letter to our central administration noting that her work was exactly what should be expected in a professional school such as ours. Her successful promotion sent a clear message that work with schools is not only valued but, contrary to conventional wisdom, can lead to promotion and tenure.

Forming Partnerships—Experimenting with New Approaches

An important point in our relationships with JCPS came in 1984 when the local Gheens Foundation gave the school district a large grant to support professional development of teachers and administrators. After a nationwide search, the district and the foundation invited Philip Schlechty to be the first director of the JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy. Schlechty, by this time, had established himself as a national leader in this field through his publications and work with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., schools. Because he had been a tenured professor at the University of North Carolina while working in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, JCPS asked us to appoint him through U of L on a similar basis. We agreed, and Schlechty began work in 1985.

Schlechty's ideas for JCPS had important implications for U of L. From the outset, he sought to create a network of schools within the

district that would serve as models of exemplary practice and sites for the induction of new teachers. He also was very interested in helping the district recruit and employ additional minority teachers. One of our faculty members had worked with Schlechty as a graduate student. We released her from some of her other responsibilities to assist him with the start-up of the new academy. We also assigned time of some other faculty members to work on other academy initiatives; eight of them served as representatives on the district-wide committee charged with writing standards for the schools that would serve as models and induction sites.

The planning committee referred to these schools as professional development schools and produced a belief statement and a process for becoming a professional development school (PDS). The process required that each school faculty become familiar with the belief statement. Sites where both the principal and a majority of the teachers (voting by secret ballot) professed support for the belief statement would be eligible for designation as professional development schools. They each would be eligible for small professional development grants from the JCPS/Gheens Academy and support of academy staff members. The process led to identification of 24 potential professional development schools in Jefferson County.

It was very clear that Schlechty and the ideas under consideration through the JCPS/Gheens Academy were on the cutting edge of professional development and school-university relationships. Working with the academy was a significant opportunity for our school and faculty, but it also posed a new set of problems. First and most important, the development of this relationship tested our definition of (and commitment to) collaboration. Whereas heretofore we had talked about parity as a principle of our work with school personnel, the history of our relationship with them had been one in which we were the teachers and they were the students. In short, it was hard for both parties to regard one another as equals; school personnel often deferred to those of us at the university, and neither party thought much about it. Schlechty and his colleagues were articulate spokespersons for the primacy of school interests. Many of us heard comments about the indifference or irrelevance of the university in a way that made us think long and hard about the meaning of true collaboration. Because those of us around the table were committed to making the relationship work, we talked openly about our differences and sought to resolve them.

We identified (and continue to grapple with) a number of problems related to differences in culture between the school and university. For example, we found it hard to schedule meetings. Teachers are obligated to

their classrooms during the days, and faculty members often have commitments scheduled weeks in advance which they are reluctant to break. University people do not understand how a call from the central office to a school representative could bring an abrupt end to a meeting. Conversely, school administrators do not understand why a dean cannot simply order faculty members to participate in a given activity at a particular time. Today we are much more sensitive to such issues, but they caused much difficulty in the early stages of scheduling planning meetings.

The relationship posed further challenges for me as dean. One was finding sufficient faculty resources to participate in the JCPS/Gheens activities. While we were able to free people from some classes, many faculty members devoted substantial amounts of additional time because they were committed to the principle of working together. A second problem was gaining recognition for the university's efforts. The superintendent of schools, mindful that the project was funded by a major grant through a local foundation, viewed and talked about all of this work as school district activity. The fact that the university received little public recognition was not lost on many of my colleagues. When they asked about me about this, I usually responded by expressing my willingness to "trade status for substance." (Cohen & March, *Leadership and Ambiguity*). Further, Schlechty was a very visible figure who, from time to time, would say or write something critical of teacher preparation programs. To the faculty members who asked why we would work with such a critic, I would respond that he was not talking about us specifically or that we should assess the merit of his views and regard him as a "loving critic."

The establishment of the JCPS/Gheens Academy was a critical event in the development of attitudes and new programs in our school. Its presence forced all of us to grapple seriously with the meaning of school-university collaboration. Unlike most school-university partnerships, the concept of professional development schools was introduced to us by the schools. We were fortunate in that the university and school district represented the "only game in town" for each other. There are only five school districts besides Jefferson County in the service area designated for U of L by the CHE, and JCPS is more than four times the size of all of them combined. Similarly, approximately half of the JCPS teachers hold one or more degrees from U of L. Thus when negotiations about any particular issue became difficult, we knew that we had to find a resolution.

In 1986, the CHE announced a statewide competition to establish "centers of excellence" at public universities. Our proposal to establish The Center for the Collaborative Advancement of the Teaching Profession was one of five (the only one in education) funded by the CHE. The

center's primary purpose was to ...."improve the quality of instruction provided K-12 students in the Commonwealth of Kentucky by focusing on the recruitment, preparation, induction, and continuing education of teachers."

The two major goals set forth in the proposal were to establish professional development schools and implement model teacher preparation programs. Professional development schools, which were to be established in cooperation with the JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy, were envisioned as "sites for the design and testing of alternative approaches to the preparation and continuing professional development of teachers and administrators." Our vision of model teacher preparation programs were those which...."represent a substantial departure from the status quo in terms of a) emphasis on intellectual breadth and rigor as well as relevance to practice, and b) recruitment of students from nontraditional sources."

The funding of this proposal accomplished several things for our school. It brought formal recognition for the university's work in developing the JCPS professional development schools. It also brought considerable status to the work of our faculty. The CHE competition for centers attracted substantial publicity. The fact that our proposal was the only one funded in education (the others were in biomedical engineering, geriatrics, supercomputing, and aquatic biology) was widely noted and increased the stature of our school in the minds of Kentucky policymakers. It also brought additional resources that could be used in a discretionary way to advance the center's agenda. In both resources and recognition, our school's acquisition of this center provided a counterpoint to the JCPS/Gheens Academy. Now each of the partners had both a letterhead and resources to contribute to our collaborative agenda.

Several design features of the CCATP are worth noting. First, as the name suggests, we envisioned doing our work with our colleagues in the schools. The proposal established Schlechty and me as codirectors. Oversight for the center was to come from an advisory board consisting of the university provost, three faculty members from our school, three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, the JCPS superintendent, the superintendent who chaired the Ohio Valley Education Cooperative, three teachers (two of whom were from Jefferson County), and two principals (one from Jefferson County and one from a rural district).

Second, we designed the center with permeable boundaries. The only personnel assigned full-time to the center were an information specialist, an administrative assistant, and a number of graduate assistants who

worked with school and university faculty members on specific projects. We brought some existing collaborative projects (e.g. the JCPS/U of L Coordinating Committee, which offers small grants to support joint initiatives, and the Minority Teacher Recruitment Project [MTRP]) under the Center umbrella as means of recognizing the collaborative nature of their work and providing them some additional resources. We also encouraged staff members to develop new projects for center support. A position we have maintained is that center support is available to anyone working on an approved part of the center agenda.

Consistent with the notion of permeable boundaries, we also designed the center to be a source of funds for a series of temporary systems. To a considerable extent, we have used center funds as seed money or venture capital. Our idea has been that we will provide support for new initiatives with the expectation that they will be incorporated into regular budget lines if they prove to be worthwhile.

The CCATP has now existed for 9 years and has experienced several personnel changes. Schlechty left JCPS and the university to establish his own consulting firm and has since been replaced by two subsequent codirectors. We have experimented with various forms of governance. Our current structure involves a full-time faculty member who directs the center, reports to me, and works with an advisory board comprised of PDS principals and teachers, some university faculty members, and the current director of the JCPS/Gheens Academy. Some of these principals and teachers come from the surrounding OVEC districts which reflects an expanded scope of center activity.

The success of the CCATP has come in many forms—not the least of which is the programs it has supported. It has also brought positive publicity to our school and a feeling of accomplishment to many whose work has been supported by it. Faculty members have come to recognize that collaboration is an important value in our School, and that success in this area will be recognized and rewarded. The external review of the center said in 1990, "The School of Education.... has given a new richness to the notion of collaboration in its design of this center. There is a sharing between the School of Education and the Jefferson County Public Schools not only of personnel and resources but also of the responsibility for planning and thinking out how the professional development of teachers ought to happen.....In the final analysis what is significant is that the School of Education is undertaking a purposeful challenge of existing academic structures, within both higher and public education."

From Experimentation to the Mainstream: Reconstituting our Programs

Prior to establishing the CCATP, our faculty accepted an invitation to become a charter member of the Holmes Group. This decision was made after several months of reflection, a visit by the chair of the Holmes Group's Board of Directors, and a joint meeting with a group of faculty members from the University of Kentucky who were contemplating the same decision. The resolution enacted by our faculty in October 1986 endorsed the goals contained in *Tomorrow's Schools* and recommended that we begin a planning process to achieve them, but also stipulated that....."any changes in....School of Education programs or policies remain the prerogative of the School of Education and will be processed through regular faculty governance procedures."

The resolution reflected faculty sentiment that affiliation with Holmes was consistent with our interest in school reform and could be beneficial to us, but it also masked concern about the possibility of closing our undergraduate teacher education programs. Including the goal in our CCATP proposal that said we would "develop model teaching programs" provided a way to address this concern. Our departments of Early and Middle Childhood Education and Secondary Education began planning experimental, alternative programs in spring 1987.

By early fall 1987, the Department of Secondary Education was ready to submit its alternative program to the state Council on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC) for approval. While responsibility for approving new teacher education programs was vested with the State Board of Education at that time, procedures required that the council review and advise the board on all such matters. The department proposed a new MAT program designed to recruit mid-career professionals from other fields into teaching. Candidates would begin the program in the summer with a series of introductory courses and some field experiences. When the school year began, they would be assigned to a cluster of high schools where each of them would have responsibility for a half time teaching load. During the other half day, they would receive additional instruction from teachers at the school and members of our faculty. Their program would conclude with a capstone seminar in the following summer term.

The program was designed by a committee of our faculty, arts and sciences faculty, and school representatives. It was to be labor-intensive for both the students and faculty who would spend considerable time with them in schools. Arrangements were made with JCPS to split eight

teaching positions, so each of the 15 or 16 candidates in the program would be paid a half-time teacher's salary. The university would provide each candidate with a tuition scholarship and center funds supported the additional instruction required in the program.

Because the program called for the participants to assume full responsibility for their classrooms before they qualified for a regular teaching certificate, we had to ask the CTEC to approve a new category of certification as part of our program proposal. There was more than a little reluctance on the part of the CTEC to do this. The members, virtually all of whom were part of the state "teacher education establishment," expressed concern that this would open the door to other alternative programs and that splitting positions to support our students would deny jobs to "fully-prepared" teachers. Two factors probably led the CTEC to grant us approval as an experimental program. First, we had strong support from the representatives of our local teacher organization who had been involved in planning the program; and second, I made it clear that if the CTEC did not approve our proposal, I would appeal their decision to the state board which previously had expressed concern about the protectionist attitudes of the CTEC.

The experimental secondary program began in summer 1988 with a group of very strong students of diverse ethnic and academic backgrounds. Although it was a very time-consuming program, faculty members enjoyed working in the program because their students were stimulating and they developed new ties with their host schools. Similarly, the teachers and principals appreciated the program. In the second and third years of the program, many of its graduates were employed by the local schools. From time to time, the local media would carry a story about how this program enabled an engineer or chemist to switch careers. Application to the program increased, and everyone associated with it felt a sense of pride.

The experimental program in early and middle childhood education started one year later. Planned by a group of faculty members with a constructivist philosophy, the program was designed to recruit new graduates with liberal arts degrees and entailed neither classes nor grades. Instead, students were required to commit themselves to the program from 9 to 5, five days a week for an entire year. Those who completed it successfully would receive an MAT degree. A cadre of approximately 15 students was admitted each year. A member of our faculty was assigned to coordinate the program on a full-time basis; others were on call to work with the group in areas of their specialization. All students were assigned in groups of three or four to a PDS site where faculty members had

agreed to mentor them. The coordinator met regularly with the students, and they planned their work together. Funds to support the program came from the CCATP.

This program also was approved on an experimental basis by the CTEC. Like its secondary counterpart, it also recruited able students who were well-received in the schools. And like the secondary program, the intensity of this experience brought closer relationships among the students, members of our faculty, and those with whom they worked in schools.

After these programs had operated for two or three years, I began to encourage the faculty to consider their implications for our basic programs. Three other factors emerged that would alter the course of these efforts. The first was that, in fall 1989, a new provost faced with serious budget problems informed us that he would withdraw the scholarship support from the secondary program the following year. The second was that the Kentucky legislature enacted the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) in 1990. This comprehensive, systemic reform package called for a standards-based approach to P-12 schooling and established a new Education Professional Standards Board to oversee a similar approach to teacher preparation. The third was that the university began a new cycle of its planning process because state and institutional budget projections showed the need for restructuring.

The provost's message prompted me to tell the department that I would withdraw CCATP support as well. Asserting that the experimental program was successful and had taught us a lot, I encouraged the faculty to incorporate these lessons into their basic program. They responded by forming a study group to consider this possibility along with KERA's reform expectations. I also encouraged the EMCE department to consider abolishing their undergraduate program. They agreed to do so but requested funds that would permit some of them to visit other universities that had made similar changes. In spring 1991, we allocated CCATP funds for several of these visits. The results were positive; those faculty visiting other programs returned and encouraged their colleagues to think seriously about shifting to a 5-year program model.

The issue was forced for us during the 1990-91 school year when the president introduced the new planning cycle. The process involved a series of study groups offering suggestions to a steering committee that also included representatives from each unit. One of the suggestions that won support from the steering committee was to "implement the Holmes plan in the school of education." This shorthand reference to eliminating undergraduate teacher preparation was consistent with a stated priority

stressing undergraduate preparation in the liberal arts. I expressed my support for doing this to the president and provost during the planning process, but I also reminded them of the need to consult our faculty before proceeding with it.

In late spring 1991, the president asked me for our response to this proposal within a period of about two weeks. Rather than convening our entire faculty to consider the issue, I went to the chairs of each teacher preparation program (EMCE, secondary, special education, health and physical education, and vocational education) and asked what their departments wanted to do. All but vocational education told me that they supported the recommendation and wanted to move to 5-year programs. Health and physical education agreed to move to a 5-year program but wanted to retain an undergraduate major as basis for teacher preparation. While I do not think there was unanimous support for this move in any department, any dissent was relatively mild.

On May 20, 1991, our Board of Trustees approved in principle *A Strategy for the 1990s*. The document called for the School of Education "....to phase out baccalaureate degree programs (exceptions: health occupations education, vocational education, and health and physical education) and replace them with programs that require teacher education candidates to complete a 5-year program that includes a baccalaureate degree in the liberal arts and a graduate degree in teacher education." Specifically, changes were to include a required undergraduate minor in teacher education (or the equivalent) for prospective teachers and special arrangements to assist students with financial aid. Planning and implementation would take place according the school's regular process of curriculum development, and detailed plans were to be announced by June 1992.

The 1991-92 academic year was a busy time for planning. I appointed an ad hoc committee on teacher education redesign with representation from each of our departments. Their charge was to recommend an overarching model that explicated the purposes, processes, outcomes, and evaluation of our new teacher education programs and to coordinate their work with that of the their respective program faculties as they developed their new programs. The ad hoc committee issued an interim report that recommended a general program model of "Teachers as Leaders" in February. Because they had been working simultaneously, each of the program faculties submitted revised programs that received initial approval by our school curriculum committee by the end of the 1991-92 academic year. The programs were refined further to reflect the new standards and assessment procedures (e.g., all students must assemble

portfolios) of the Kentucky Educational Standards Board. All had been approved by the standards board in December 1993, and students began to enter the new programs in 1994.

The new programs are based in our professional development schools. During the past two years, we decided to focus our energies in 10 of these schools. Seven of the schools are in Jefferson County, and the others are in each of three adjacent counties. Six of them are primary schools, two are middle schools, and two are high schools. Unlike most universities that have established relationships with professional development schools, our work began most extensively and has progressed the farthest at the high school level. This is attributable primarily to the JCPS initiatives and the success of both the school district and university in attracting outside funds to support this work. Three years ago, we received another foundation grant to support the development of PDSes at the primary level. At this point, we have no external support for this work. We have reallocated faculty time from our base budget and used some CCATP funds for operating support in our PDS work.

All students in our new programs spend considerable time in a PDS where they are supported by members of our faculty and school-based mentors. We presented plaques to each of the PDSes which denote our relationship and now hang in their lobbies. We also have extended adjunct appointments to school-based mentors, and we are working on new governance relationships for our schools and some of the PDSes.

Continuing Issues

The last group of undergraduate teacher education majors were admitted to our program in fall 1994. At the same time, we had about 70 students in our new secondary program and 15 in the primary program. By fall 1995, we had nearly 100 students in the secondary program and approximately 20 in the primary program. An additional 50 students were enrolled in the undergraduate core sequence with the intention of entering the graduate program in the summer. For the first time, there was a sufficient number of middle school candidates to enable this program to begin.

These numbers have been a source of concern for some faculty members. In a time of continuing fiscal concern for higher education, they worry that the new programs will attract insufficient numbers of students to sustain our current level of funding. I explained that the university understands that we are shifting to a graduate program and expects some decline in total enrollments. Moreover, because the state

subsidy for graduate students is greater than for undergraduates, our new programs will actually bring more state funds to the institution. Nonetheless the uncertainty of the situation is troublesome for some of our colleagues.

Implementing these programs has also caused some tension among the faculty. Because we have placed such a priority on establishing them in recent years, faculty members in other than teacher education departments have felt neglected or undervalued. We also are finding that collaborative teaching requires faculty members to change their behavior. Nearly all of the courses and seminars in the new program are team-taught. Sharing responsibility for a class has been a new and challenging experience in several instances. However, we are committed to modeling the kind of collaborative teaching called for in contemporary classrooms. Learning to do this well is part of our own professional development.

Finally, because we consider our partnership with the schools so fundamental to our program, we find that we must continually adjust to changes within the schools. When there is a change in the principalship of a PDS, we must work with the new person to sustain our relationship. Fortunately, we have learned that this can be done but it is not a given. Changes in school district priorities or personnel shifts in the central office have new relevance to us. We feel that we have a greater stake in the leadership of the schools and districts with which we work, and we are eager for new personnel to understand and support our collaborative efforts. Similarly, we want to help them with their agendas. It is clear that the direction that we have taken makes us more dependent on the schools than ever before. At the same time, it is also clear that recognition of our interdependence gives the university and the schools greater leverage to strengthen the profession and improve the education of children and youth.

Reflections on "What Works"

I conclude with some reflections on why these changes occurred and, more specifically, what I did to facilitate them. I offer them with the caveat that biases and blind spots may inhibit my ability to fully understand my role in these events. It is also true that interpretation after the fact can make theories (and individuals) appear more powerful than appropriate. It is in this spirit that I venture some comments on "what works" for me as dean.

I have been a sports fan for many years. I enjoy the competition, the excitement, and the fellowship of athletic events, and believe that sports teach lessons that are helpful in other parts of life. One such lesson is found in a book by Ohio State University football coach W.W. "Woody"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hayes, *You Win With People*. In it, he discusses the importance for leaders to surround themselves with strong people, and then to teach them to work together and take pride in what they do. There are dozens of books and articles that offer a similar message, but Hayes was one of the first to say it in a way that especially reached me. "You win with people" is an aphorism which I heed.

Many people contributed to the changes and successes we have enjoyed at Louisville. Some were here when I arrived; many came later. Most share a common view of what it means to be a professional school. Some were present as we talked about this and formed our initial ideas about it. Others came later, joined the conversation, and helped the rest of us refine our ideas. Without exception, these are individuals of great ability, enthusiasm, and ideas. My contribution to the mix has been to help recruit many of them and nurture a climate where they feel free to share and act upon their ideas.

My strategies for providing a nurturing climate derive from my understanding of "path-goal theory," a leadership theory promulgated in the 1970s (House, 1973). Briefly summarized, path-goal theory asserts that a leader's role is to clarify goals and ease the path toward their accomplishment for members of a group—an apt description of what deans do. We work with individuals and, perhaps more importantly, groups to clarify goals. We help individuals think through career priorities, research initiatives, or service opportunities, and we work with departments and faculty committees to identify department and schoolwide priorities. As these goals become clear, the role of the leader shifts to helping others find and take the path toward their accomplishment. Here, the leadership process becomes highly individualized. Some people require no help; in this instance, the wise leader gets out of the way. Others may need instruction, or financial support, or a contact with another agency that can help them, or simply the encouragement to try something new. I wrote earlier of "trying to say yes" to others. I did and continue to do so in this context.

Implicit in this discussion is the belief that leadership is a process of helping others be successful. The test of a leader is not so much what he or she does as it is what they enable others to do. Moreover, people are most likely to do things which they are both interested in and likely to succeed at. Early in my tenure as dean, I began to ask people what they would like to do and how I might help them. It is one direct way of discovering the path toward meeting their goal. I have also learned that another important aspect of leadership is helping others be confident in the face of uncertainty. This is not always easy, for ambiguity is a hall-

mark of most leadership situations. Sometimes, however, it can be as simple as dispelling baseless rumors. In situations of greater complexity, careful homework that includes an assessment of all foreseeable alternatives can ease the comfort with which others act.

An example of this from the current case study involved our decisions to eliminate undergraduate teacher preparation programs in favor of a professional year program leading to the MAT degree. We made these decisions after gaining assurance from area school officials that our graduates would be welcomed as beginning teachers even though they would be more expensive than new teachers with bachelor's degrees. We also gained the understanding of the central administration that this change would probably lead to some overall reductions in our enrollments. Nonetheless, some faculty members feared that this action would hurt our school financially to the point of losing faculty positions. Noting this and believing the decisions to eliminate undergraduate programs should be made by the people most likely affected by this change, I asked individual departments rather than the faculty at large to make these recommendations. I confess that when first-year enrollments in our new MAT program did not meet our expectations, I had a few second thoughts which I did not share. More noteworthy, however, is that the faculty leaders who deliver these programs expressed no reservations but redoubled their efforts to recruit students and refine the programs. Today, enrollments are up and there is little remaining doubt that these programs will succeed.

Another strategy that I have found helpful is to invest in understanding and utilizing formal planning systems. Within our school, the implementation of a strategic planning process has served as an important means of communicating and coming to consensus about our priorities. A recent example involved several faculty-staff-student work groups, all of whom shared their ideas with our entire school community by email. Their final product appears to be widely understood and accepted.

Our use of this process has been at least as helpful in winning support from our central administration. When our former president first came to the university in 1982, he announced that we would introduce a strategic planning process that would be coordinated through an office of planning and budget reporting directly to him. Our faculty and staff worked hard to develop a good initial plan, and my office has developed very positive working relationships with the office of planning and budget. The staff in that office understand our programs and our plans for improving them. Our school has a reputation for planning effectively and submitting reports

in a timely and accurate fashion. I strongly believe that this has contributed to the school's relatively positive treatment in budgetary matters.

Another example where this strategy made a difference occurred when we sought approval of the Council on Higher Education to offer doctoral degrees. The CHE executive director had made public statements about the importance of our university's "urban mission." I engaged him and members of his staff in a series of conversations about our proposal (and particularly its relationship to our urban mission) while it was still in a developmental stage. My objective was to have this proposal brought before the CHE with a favorable staff recommendation. Thus, when others began to raise political objections to it, we had the "impartial and expert" staff helping us make our case.

Another useful way of conceptualizing the dean's position is to regard it as a boundary-spanning role. Schools and colleges are open systems that interact regularly with other organizations in their environment. The dean is in a key position. He or she is the official representative of the school by virtue of position. Deans of other schools, the central administration, the state department of education, and representatives of other agencies will think of the dean as the first formal contact between their organization and the school. Thus the dean has the "first chance" to interpret his or her school and these other organizations to one another. A dean who understands this and strives to be in touch with others can establish strong contacts with area school districts, teacher organizations, administrator and school board groups, state and federal offices, etc.

The significance of the boundary-spanning role is that, through it, the dean helps the school and other agencies anticipate and respond to one another. I spend a lot of time in this role, since it is an important source of my ability to shape policy for our school. People rely on me to understand and explain the possible consequences of alternative actions with respect to others. Thus, for example, our faculty sought my assurance that school districts would hire graduates of our fifth-year programs and the central administration would accept some decline in enrollments. In another example, my contact with state board of education members and other state officials persuaded me that I could push the Council on Teacher Education and Certification to approve our proposal for alternative certification programs. In fact, it was earlier contacts with state legislators and members of their staffs that made me see the inevitability of some form of alternative certification in the state. Acting on this knowledge, I encouraged our faculty to develop alternatives that we would consider professionally responsible.

A dean who is an effective boundary-spanner helps to put his or her school in a position to "capitalize on the inevitable." When the Gheens Foundation decided to make a major investment in the professional development of teachers in the Jefferson County Public Schools, it was clear that this would have implications for our School. Rather than consider the new JCPS/Gheens Academy as competition, we chose to work with them not only on matters of professional development but also in teacher preparation. The results of this effort have benefited the university as well as the school district.

Deans, of course, are not the only boundary-spanners in schools and colleges of education. Other faculty and staff have ability and inclination in this direction, which deans should encourage and support. At U of L, I have found that people with common goals who share information will typically come to consensus around good decisions. We have worked to implement this perspective in shaping our programs. Perhaps the distinguishing characteristic in our experience has been our consistent effort to broaden our consensus to include our colleagues in the schools.

References

Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity.* Berkeley, CA: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

House, R.J. (1971). "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership* (pp. 141-177). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hayes, W. W. Jr. (1973). *You work with people.* Columbus, OH: Typographic Print Co.

Creating Community in the School of Education: Influencing Habits of Mind, Discourse, Work, & Results

Gail Huffman-Joley

> The main way you achieve change is to help people think differently about who they are and what they do. That's all change is. You don't change a system. You change people's attitudes and behaviors and sense of hope.
>
> *Ernest L. Boyer,* Education Week, *May 24, 1995*

An immediate and major challenge faced me upon assuming the deanship of the School of Education (SOE) at Indiana State University (ISU) in 1991. The university's Board of Trustees voted to close the SOE's traditional laboratory school. The board's decision meant that at the end of 1992, the primary site for early field experience for the school's hundreds of undergraduate future teachers and the clinical setting for graduate students in specialized fields would be gone. Another significant event was looming: a team visit from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to determine ISU's accreditation status under its new standards. Field-experience components were an important program element to be reviewed. The initial visit represented major stakes for the SOE and the university—as the vice president for academic affairs said, "NCATE is something we cannot afford to fail."

During the preceding 4 years, while I served as associate dean for academic affairs and then as acting dean, some of the faculty and I had begun to change how we conducted our work. The board's decision to close the laboratory school could be interpreted as a perceived and real erosion of the SOE's capacity and resources—or as a window of opportunity for more pervasive reform, with the SOE linking to public schools through a professional development schools partnership, and a far greater impact.

In this chapter, I will describe the significant changes accomplished and the strategies used since the board's decision. My primary emphasis is on the SOE's community and culture—on changing "how we do business." We have worked to change the norms and working relationships in the school, on the campus, and in the public schools and agencies

which have become our partners. We have used a range of strategies, with a particular emphasis on: (1) altering, expanding, and enriching the discourses, in part by making use of experts from many locations; (2) changing the pattern and frequency of interaction (e.g., across departments, in pedagogically focused study groups); (3) creating new contexts for work (e.g., collaborative PDS partnerships with schools and agencies); (4) integrating major expectations for faculty into the routine fabric of their work (e.g., teaching, scholarship, and service); (5) supporting faculty in making new connections with each other and with public school colleagues; and (6) redefining the meaning of quality teaching, scholarship, and service by articulating the role of the professoriate in a contemporary professional school of education. We have sought to link school reform to reform in the ways we as professors of education prepare and continue to work with educational professionals. In short, we have been working together to create a learning community among ourselves and with our colleagues in public schools and agencies. As a learning community, we accept change as the norm and commit ourselves to working and learning together, to improve learning for our students and ourselves.

Why did I choose to focus on changing the culture, climate, and community of the School of Education? In my view, significant change in behavior, norms, roles, and working relationships does not come about through top-down mandates or edicts. Nor does it happen solely through the implementation of *a new program* or through major reorganization of the unit. Rather, real and lasting change comes about developmentally, over time, with participants working and learning together around mutually established interests and a sense of purpose. As the Boyer quotation which heads this chapter suggests, helping people think differently about who they are as professors of education, and how they approach their work, remains for me the ongoing goal and the catalyst for building community in the school.

Gardner explores a similar theme in his analysis of cognitive approaches to leadership. Leaders in positions in democratic societies, leaders by choice, he terms them, are his focus. He notes that they tend to be inclusive—they seek to bring more people into their circle rather than to exclude others, and that they are motivated "in large measure by the desire to effect changes," rather than simply by a lust for power. He proposes that understanding the nature and process of leadership of this nature can be enhanced "as we come to understand better the arena in which leadership necessarily occurs—namely, the human mind" (Gardner, 1995, p.15). Not only the mind of the leader, but equally, the minds of the "audience members or collaborators," and "the mental structures

97

activated in leaders and followers" constitute essential considerations (p.17). While I would not presume that the cases of the extraordinary public leaders whom he analyzes are necessarily comparable to my role as dean of ISU's School of Education, I find numerous similarities in their values and in how they approached their work. Working to change people's attitudes and behaviors and sense of hope, particularly important in these times when hard-working educators are regularly blamed for society's ills, are primary in my mind. These goals are directly linked to my emphasis on the culture and community of the school of education.

In a chapter on community and culture, Gregory and Smith (1987) note, "Probably the most important segment of a school's culture is the degree to which all its inhabitants see themselves as one group that collaborates to make the school work, that is, the extent to which they experience a sense of community." These authors cite Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin's (1983) earlier work on the importance of the school community in the development of distinctive normative patterns that will have a profound effect on self-concepts, values, and skills of the school community participants. While the writers were describing culture as it relates to the high school, their ideas about the effect of culture and community may be applied to schools of education.

> If culture is the complex web of elements that constitute a way of life, then community is the essence of that way of life. Culture is analogous to an atom with community as its nucleus. Community is the binding force that draws people of a culture into a more or less harmonious interactive network (Gregory and Smith, 1987, p. 50).

If human interaction in the community is going to be productive and the community is to have positive, lasting impact, I believe certain values are critical to the culture and must be nurtured.

Fundamentally, I believe in acting upon democratic principles and using democratic practices when working with others, whether they be youngsters in my former elementary, suburban, midwestern classrooms; African American preschoolers in inner-city schools where I have taught; first-generation college students in my university classes; or faculty in the school of education. People are better able to learn and to develop their strengths and abilities when their contributions are recognized and appreciated by the larger group. To enable ideas to flourish and individuals to grow requires not only recognizing contributions but also creating multiple opportunities for demonstrating, sharing, and combining of talents. Better ideas usually emerge when people work together to establish mutually developed agendas, interests, and goals. I believe that

when these supportive conditions exist, trust, commitment, and common language develop, which help to build bonds among the participants. In this kind of environment, people are more likely to take risks in trying out new ideas. Most people—young children, practicing teachers, or seasoned academics—like being intellectually alive and curious about life; in other words, they like being learners, no matter what their age. As learners, they construct meaning and knowledge; they think and change, linking new ideas and building expanded concepts on those which they already know and have experienced.

Whether the teacher or the dean, I need to know something about what the learners know, what their strengths and areas of interest are, so that I can better support them in experiencing new ideas. I affirm, encourage, nudge, and sometimes prod the learners toward further learning, growth, and change. I work with the learners to establish a sense of purpose and goals for the group and to develop strategies to be used to achieve the goals.

I seek to have learners invest themselves, take ownership and responsibility for their own learning, and link with others to do the same, so that the community strengthens and grows. Active engagement of all of us, including me, in our own learning is important. Hearing about new ideas directly from experts, visiting innovative places, trying out ideas, being in field-based sites to experience firsthand the realities characteristic of the location deepen understanding and learning. I personally help to create varied and numerous opportunities for community participants to act on these values and I personally engage in many of the activities with them.

Finally, I believe that most of us as educators care about making a difference in the lives of our students as future educators and, ultimately, in the lives of their students, because, fundamentally, that is the reason we were drawn to the professoriate in the first place. These beliefs are at the heart of my professional self-image and consequently, guiding how I *dean* including my efforts to create a learning community and a changed culture in the school of education.

I did not plan to become an administrator. After being in higher education for only 2 years as a new assistant professor, I was asked to become the acting chair of a large department of education—the third largest department on the university campus. Naively, I agreed to do so. I had struggled with the decision to become acting chair, in part because my teaching assignments needed to be substantially reduced due to the administrative load. I greatly enjoyed teaching, believed I was reasonably good at it but always sought to be better, and I didn't want to lose that important aspect of my university life. The following year I was selected as the regular chair, and I served in that role for seven years, when I came

to Indiana State University. Thus, while never considering the possibility of administration earlier, I've been at this, full time, ever since.

Someone advised me then that good administration is good teaching in the broader sense of the term. I've grown to believe that deeply, and over the years I have increasingly acted on that premise. Whether as a classroom teacher-learner or as a dean teacher-learner, I've seen and experienced the positive effects of a supportive, collaborative, intellectually stimulating culture and climate—in other words, a learning community. That is what I, working with many others—faculty, chairpersons, central administrators, and colleagues in the public schools—have tried to bring about as dean of ISU's School of Education .

A SNAPSHOT: The School of Education THEN

When I joined the SOE in 1987 as associate dean for academic affairs, I perceived conditions to be static. Faculty seemed to do their business in the same ways they had for years: cordial to each other; small talk of sports and campus politics in the faculty lounge, mostly among the majority of graying, white, middle-aged males; sound undergraduate and graduate programs and service-outreach clinics; little faculty interaction across departments for either academic or social purposes; little sustained interaction with public schools beyond student teacher placement; research and scholarly work primarily fostered in *graduate* departments, not *teacher education* departments and typically conducted in isolation by one person working with one or a few subjects, on a topic of interest to that professor; computers being used by a few *whizzes* who had struggled to obtain equipment; and people working in a rather dreary, *worn-looking* environment that did not project the mission and work of the school to its students, faculty, and visitors. I perceived SOE *and indeed the university* at that time as a sleeping giant with latent potential and strength, but relatively dormant.

The large majority of faculty were caring, well-intentioned, and hard-working people, devoted to the institution they served, interested in their students and in providing quality instruction for them. Many took pride that the university's roots to teacher education ran deep: the campus had been founded as a normal school for teacher preparation in 1865. As the normal school had evolved to become a comprehensive university, however, the school of education faculty, like their counterparts in state universities across the country with similar histories, had lost sight of the role of a professional school of education and had, for the most part, grown far apart from their primary constituents—public school educa-

tors—during the intervening years. In 1987, the SOE was seen by many public school people as dated and out of touch with the reality of contemporary classrooms.

Changing the Climate: Planting Seeds for Change

Seeds for change in the SOE were being planted, however, as I came on board as associate dean. The dean had just launched a program aimed at encouraging faculty to work with people in public schools on school-improvement projects. "Partners for Educational Progress," or "PEP," as it was called, was one of my major responsibilities.

While we in the SOE were not yet talking overtly about major reform in teacher preparation, we increasingly were persuaded by reformers such as Clifford and Guthrie (1987) that, as a professional school of education, we needed to reconnect much more closely with our public school colleagues. We also knew that, to more effectively work with teachers and administrators on school-based projects, we needed to change the university faculty's traditional approach and behavior toward faculty in the schools.

I had come to ISU with considerable experience regarding universities and public schools working as partners for staff development and program delivery. While chairing the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of North Carolina-Charlotte, I helped lead the university and the large local school district in two major endeavors, both collaboratively designed and delivered. I also had experienced the downside of school-university partnerships—turf battles, power struggles, and governance disagreements. Nevertheless, I felt comfortable in schools and working with school people. I spoke the language of teachers. Most of all, I enjoyed helping to create new structures and innovative programs between the two institutions that could benefit from, and respond to, our common interest in the development of teachers and students. School-university partnerships seemed a natural to me.

In PEP's early days, the PEP codirector and I met with a small group of SOE faculty and talked about the SOE's school-improvement projects being based on three important premises, drawn from research literature and selected to help lay the foundation for change in faculty thinking and behavior. The premises were: 1) that the relationship be collegial, not the traditional consulting attitude that the university person had the answers which would be conveyed to the school person; 2) that the project agenda be mutually determined and meaningful for both participants, not the traditional posture with the research focus identified by the university researcher and conducted on or passed to others; and 3) that the project

must be developmental, long-term, not the traditional university consulting of the *here today, gone tomorrow* variety. These shared understandings became the fundamental principles in how the SOE faculty would work with public school colleagues. They also served as nascent indicators of change in the SOE culture.

PEP was intended to encourage more SOE faculty to join this kind of work, provide institutional endorsement for the labor-intensive school-university partnerships, assist faculty in finding interested partners for their areas of expertise and in seeking extramural funding, and engage in sustained staff development of SOE faculty to advance these goals. Modest funds, provided by the university administration, were made available to faculty to support their collaborative work.

To bring focus to faculty learning, the PEP codirector and I compiled a collection of literature on educational reform and change, drawing heavily upon the work of Fullan, Lanier, Lieberman, McLaughlin, Schlechty, Goodlad, Sarason, Carnegie committees, the Holmes Group, and others. Faculty regularly received this steadily evolving bibliography, were encouraged to use these resources, and asked for additions.

I met regularly with the SOE Willey Colloquium Series Committee which planned programs for SOE faculty. Previously, the annual offerings had seemed unfocused and spotty in quality. For the series, the committee and I began to bring to campus nationally known consultants who were knowledgeable about school reform initiatives with implications for colleges of education. These experts interacted with faculty in large group presentations and small groups and committees, sometimes over meals.

Gradually, the SOE's culture began to change. Increasing numbers of faculty across SOE departments began coming voluntarily to PEP meetings, talking about their projects and the ideas they had been learning about. Faculty were making connections with each other and with me and having sustained conversations around common areas of interest. Although many were full professors in mid-career or nearing the end of long careers, they were nonetheless thinking about new ideas and new possibilities. They were linking with nationally recognized experts—leaders who were personable, engaging, and provocative. PEP helped to shape the emerging community and set the stage for further change.

About 20 projects began during those 3 years, varying greatly in size, focus, and degree of success. The PEP door was open to all faculty in the SOE, so that all could participate if they desired. My role was to talk with faculty, both individually and collectively, about their areas of expertise and what they might like to do. Then I tried to find ways to help them act on their ideas, such as making contacts with superinten-

dents, principals, teachers, or funding sources. Sometimes the PEP codirector and I would accompany them for initial meetings with potential school partners. I also planned strategies with them for approaching funders, and usually we would approach possible sources as a team.

The Indiana-based Lilly Endowment, Inc., represented such a source, but the university had not received a grant for many years. The former dean, the PEP codirector, and I had our initial meeting with the endowment's program officer to seek support of PEP. While the officer believed PEP's work was worthwhile, she thought schools of education should have been engaged in these activities all along, wondered what had taken us so long to see the light, and believed the operation should be wholly funded by ISU. As the sobering meeting was nearing an end, the program officer mentioned the endowment might be interested in funding something with focus on middle schools.

I coauthored the proposal for our initial planning grant awarded by the endowment and worked closely with the faculty member who wrote the major, multi-year grant. Through this grant, which funded a middle school self-assessment project focused on schoolwide change, many of us learned firsthand about principles for fostering whole-school change. These were critical learnings because most of us had been narrowly prepared in disciplines focused only on one aspect of schooling. We also were establishing relationships and credibility with endowment officials, who, from that time, have continued their support of our work.

Several PEP projects resulted in increased trust, greater understanding, and stronger relationships between SOE faculty members and faculty in particular schools. Our learning about school change, strengthened relationships with several public schools, and developing relationships with personnel at the Lilly Endowment brought even bigger dividends when we sought to deepen our collaboration with the schools through the professional development schools partnership.

After 3 years, I interviewed faculty and principals who were involved in PEP projects about their benefits. Surprisingly, the benefits for both school and university faculty were similar. Both groups reported that the professional interaction resulting from the projects reduced their isolation and were intellectually renewing and stimulating to them as professionals. The projects and the resulting interaction were affirming for them as professionals. For SOE faculty in mid-to-late career, the school-based work affirmed they still had talents and contributions to make that were useful in the real world of public schools. PEP also brought increased

institutional value and commitment to university-school partnering, an activity traditionally given scant recognition.

The interviews provided evidence that PEP helped meet important needs of learners in the expanding community. It provided for some a renewal, a "sense of hope," in the words of Ernest Boyer. It supported ongoing learning between university and school partners and laid a foundation for increasing change in the SOE'S culture .

For me, the faculty development work through PEP enabled me to know the faculty in ways that would have been impossible under usual conditions. Through the collaborative work of PEP, I learned their strengths and their particular areas of professional interest, and often about their personal interests such as travel and books. As a PEP participant myself, I had a faculty development project focused on the language arts underway at a local elementary school, and so we had school-based experiences in common to share. Our PEP meetings were the vehicle which enabled me to find connections, so that collectively, we could better know, share, and begin to draw upon, our many strengths.

This is an example of me as the teacher learning the interests and expertise of the learners in the community. I sought to establish bonds and develop trust with and among them, so that I could better enable the group to collectively build on what we knew so we could continue our learning. Knowing the faculty in this way helped set the climate for a deeper sense of community and greatly contributed to our collective ability to accomplish future changes.

There were two other initiatives occurring concurrently which also influenced cultural change. I had an active role in both. The SOE and the College of Arts and Sciences received institutional support to aid ISU in becoming a founding member of Project 30, a national network to encourage closer ties between arts and sciences faculty and education faculty. Our faculties continue to work together as colleagues, more closely than many on other campuses, in part because of the mutual goals established through Project 30.

The other initiative was a schoolwide task group charged by the dean to recommend principles and guidelines for undergraduate teacher education at ISU. I served as cochair of this group and was the primary author of the resulting document. Many of the values, beliefs, and themes outlined above (e.g., collaboration with school partners, active engagement of learners, and inquiry integral to educator preparation) were featured. According to some faculty, the process and document signaled a change in how the SOE would do business.

From the Loss of Lab School to Professional Development Schools

The dean left in spring 1990 at the end of my third year as associate dean. I was named acting dean. I soon was informed by the VPAA that the laboratory school was "on the bubble." The contract with the local school corporation was nearly up, the estimated costs for the building's needed renovation were formidable, and it was unlikely that the Indiana legislature would fund the project or that the school district would assume a significant portion of renovation costs. The ISU Board of Trustees seemed inclined to close the school. As a long shot, the VPAA suggested that the SOE develop a proposal which would reconceptualize the lab school's use in the hope that it might persuade the board to keep the school.

I led this SOE initiative, mobilizing and chairing a broad-based planning committee, including central administrators and teachers from the public schools, as well as key faculty and chairpersons on-campus. We proposed to have the laboratory school become a professional development school with the lab school as hub, working closely with other public schools in the region. Although the proposal was supported by the SOE, the local school corporation, the faculty senate, the VPAA, and the president, the Board of Trustees voted to close the laboratory school without discussing the proposal with me or my SOE colleagues. The vote came in May, the same week that I was appointed dean. (The university president had announced his retirement a month before, a fact probably not insignificant in the board's decision.)

The Board of Trustees' decision to close the laboratory school was a psychological blow for me as the unit leader. I personally, with many others, had worked hard to bring consensus among the many constituent groups for a strong, forward-thinking proposal to reconceive a traditional laboratory school. While feeling deflated because of the decision, I knew I had my work cut out for me. The board's decision eliminated the SOE's major site for clinical experience for our undergraduate and graduate students. With a NCATE review coming in two years, clinical program components needed to be in place. The pressure was on.

I had in the back of my mind the beginnings of an alternative plan, an adaptation of the PDS idea. During conversations about funding the lab school proposal with the Lilly program officer—who had become a trusted colleague, coach, and friend —we had discussed implications for adapting the PDS idea with local schools.

On the Monday following the board's Friday decision, I met with the VPAA. I began to make the case for the resources the SOE would need to recapture to maintain quality field components in our programs. I also began to talk about the PDS idea as we now turned to the public schools, not just for field sites for students, but for much more serious, in-depth collaboration.

During the summer I chaired a reconstituted, broadly-based group and called it our SOE Planning-for-a-Plan Committee. We brought back our consultants, Nancy Zimpher and Ken Howey, who had been with us before as Adams Visiting Scholars. Just as one-shot consulting was ineffective for long-term growth for school faculty, bringing experts for only a day did little to support significant change for faculty in higher education. Instead, using a bequest to the SOE had enabled Zimpher and Howey to work with us regularly for two or three days at a time, over 18 months. During that time, they sometimes had met with various combinations of faculty, committees, the VPAA, and me. They coached, served as a sounding board, or facilitated sessions on major SOE planning efforts. Some major topics included NCATE preparation and the conceptual framework for our knowledge base, revision of the SOE mission and goals, and ideas for our building's renovation to better communicate and support our work.

Zimpher and Howey met with the Planning-for-a-Plan Committee to help conceptualize a PDS program. By the end of the summer, the committee and I arrived at a consensus. The SOE's associate dean provided a draft of our collective understandings so that everyone understood and agreed upon the university's PDS definition and its major components.

The overarching goal of the PDS plan was to tie reform in schools to reform in educator preparation through the creation of a PDS partnership between the university and public schools. A PDS site could be a regular elementary, middle, or high school. Its four primary purposes were: (1) to improve learning for all students at the PDS site; (2) to develop exemplary field sites for future educators in schools where teachers were not isolates but team members working toward schoolwide goals; (3) to provide ongoing staff development for school and university faculty through programs selected by them in support of school goals; and (4) to foster collaborative inquiry between school and university faculty.

The year was TOUGH! We were trying to convince the public schools and many of our faculty of two major new ideas. Instead of looking only to the schools to change as we had in the earlier school-improvement projects, the proposed PDS program fundamentally linked the reform in schools to educator preparation. We were asking not only

for the schools to agree to work with our students and us in new ways, but also that each PDS site agree to develop a 5-year plan for its own improvement. We would apply to the Indiana School 2000 (IN 2000) program, sponsored by the Indiana Department of Education, established to encourage school reform in the state.

Leadership in the SOE still appeared quite traditional at that time. Consultants, when first seeing the nine male chairpersons and me, dubbed us Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. The chairpersons of the SOE teacher education departments, who had each held their positions for more than 15 years, were not anxious for change. "Just get us early field experience sites, Gail. We'll worry about a PDS program another time," they would tell me.

During the fall, the PEP director and I met many times with very cautious and conservative top administrators from the local school district, who were uneasy about working with "university types." The laboratory school had been considered a *liberal* place by many public school people, perceived as deluged with ISU teacher education students and lax standards and discipline. Thus, the public schools feared that a PDS relationship with the SOE meant an unwelcome change to a traditional lab school. Moreover, public school faculty's experience with some university faculty had not been altogether positive. The teachers, viewing themselves as overworked and underpaid, worried they would be taking on extra duties by working with university students.

The PEP director and I led the SOE teams which met repeatedly with school administrators, union representatives, school personnel, and school boards. At their request, after receiving general approval to take the proposal forward to the schools and teachers, the PEP director and I made videotapes so that the same message could be conveyed to many schools more quickly. Classroom teachers wanted to control the number of university students in their classrooms, and the school wanted the same control over numbers within the school. The union asked that a stipend or honorarium be paid to teachers who worked with university students and that the teachers choose whether or not to have university students in their classrooms. All of these points were included the written proposal with the stipulation that at least half of the teachers at the school must be supportive of becoming a PDS site and be willing to work with university students.

While the school plans for reform could assume any model which the school community itself developed, a commitment to a long-range plan for improvement was fundamental to becoming a PDS site. Linked to the plan was a requirement for ongoing staff development. We wanted

our future educators prepared in sites where teachers worked together around schoolwide goals for change rather than isolated.

At times, individuals would question whether we were pushing too hard or trying to do too much too quickly. Why did we need 10 schools? Why not begin with one or two? Why not simply ask the schools to join us as PDS partners and not concurrently ask them to develop a plan for school change and apply for an IN 2000 grant?

We argued that we needed diversity in settings: elementary, middle, and high school sites; rural and urban; and multiple school districts. I did not want the PDS partnership to be peripheral to the mainstream program, when it could more readily be dropped in a short time when interest lagged and problems arose. With a relatively large teacher preparation program enrolling 1,400 students, the SOE could handle numerous PDS sites.

We updated the Planning-for-a-Plan Committee on our progress, and the committee kept the rest of their SOE colleagues informed. I provided regular updates to the SOE Administrative Council, the SOE Faculty Congress, and the university's Teacher Education Committee and eventually received approval from all for the PDS plan.

During this time, I also scheduled regular interviews with the Terre Haute *Tribune Star*'s education reporter to explain and provide updates on the PDS proposal. She had covered the lab school as PDS campaign, usually with front-page stories. I learned then that providing her with accurate information and background resulted in balanced, supportive, and prominently placed articles about the SOE's work. Positive articles about the PDS plan and its goals for public schools and teacher preparation, with quotes from me and others, were regularly featured in the local press.

Throughout this period, I met regularly with the vice president for academic affairs, apprising him of the negotiations and implications for the necessary PDS resources. He had agreed to the addition of five clinical faculty lines in the teacher education departments. Monies for block grants to the sites, modest honoraria for teachers, tuition waivers for teachers to increase their expertise in support of schoolwide goals, and funds to support collaborative inquiry projects between faculty members at the PDS sites and the university became part of the PDS budget, supported directly by the university. From the earliest projections to our final proposal, he remained keenly interested and steadfast in his support.

Even with the changes made in the PDS proposal and the many visits of our SOE team to the various school sites, the majority of faculty in many schools voted against the PDS idea. The PEP director remarked that it was like asking 10 women to marry you and they all said no. We persisted, meeting repeatedly to personally assure school faculty of our

intentions and commitments. By early spring 1992, faculty and principals in a few sites were cautiously expressing interest and the local school district administrators were publicly supporting the PDS proposal.

An additional complication was a *save the lab school* campaign by the ISU Faculty Senate, strongly supported by a number of SOE faculty, some of whom were lab school teachers or spouses of teachers. Front-page stories about the controversy appeared in the local press. The campaign culminated in a confrontational public meeting between advocates and the Board of Trustees.

The VPAA had asked me to speak to the board at the meeting, to update them about the PDS idea with local schools. When I arrived, the room was filled with anxious, angry, or simply curious faculty, many of whom were lab school teachers. I reported on our PDS negotiations with the schools, and also commented that the views of the ISU faculty in the room should be heard. When I finished, the board chairman thanked me and continued on to the next item on the agenda. The room exploded. Faculty shouted at the board members. Finally, the board listened to several faculty speak individually, which helped to bring order to the room. The board did not back off its earlier decision to close the school.

Throughout that Academic year, the 30 to 35 lab school faculty, all assigned to the SOE and about to lose the primary jobs they had known for years, were understandably very anxious and uncertain. If they were tenured, could they stay? If so, what would they do? If they were tenured but wanted to enhance their future options by taking advanced degrees, would the university provide support? If they were near retirement, could the pot be "sweetened" so that they could retire now? These and a host of other concerns required extensive meetings.

Despite this public relations circus, 10 schools in four area school districts made a commitment to join with us as serious partners through a PDS consortium by late spring 1992. Unprecedented 5-year agreements to work together were signed. Of the 10 sites, a majority were those where bonds between our faculty and that school had been established earlier through PEP school improvement projects, where relationships and trust had begun to develop.

We had finally agreed on a common path. Our sense of collective commitment was growing, and our momentum was building towards the kind of learning community that most felt was in reach. At the same time, the university named a new president. Things were looking up!

A Learning Community: Strategies for Working & Learning Together

Conditions have changed rather dramatically in the SOE during the intervening 5 years. Learning community members have worked in multiple ways to create a new culture: to focus, expand, and enrich the discourse; to establish new worksites and working relationships in collaboration with PDS partners, whicl now include urban Indianapolis PDS sites; to invest in faculty development and program strategies that give priority to joint work; to have the central gathering places in the SOE building itself invite others and ourselves to better know and share our work; to model and use instructional and computer technology as a core aspect of our work; to make collaborative inquiry and projects an integral part of teaching and service; and to have inquiry be a *habit of mind* for our faculty, PDS colleagues, and prospective teachers.

The following strategies both stimulate cultural change and, in their continuous adaptations, ultimately become part of the culture. They form the new habits we create to work and learn together.

Creating Internal Networks with Interdisciplinary Faculty Study-and-Action Teams

Fostering internal networks across departmental lines has been an important community-building strategy. Our UNITE planning team chose to use UNITE as an umbrella to encourage change across the school. We work in voluntary, interdisciplinary study groups, called UNITE teams, in the SOE on topics of interest to all faculty and important to our school change effort overall. More than half of the SOE faculty from all departments have participated, and faculty from our PDS sites are often members of these groups. Themes selected for focused study included diversity and the preparation of educators for urban schools, active engagement and performance-based assessment of K-16 learners, collaborative inquiry with PDS sites, and clinical supervision. The teams provided a structure for sustained study, dialogue, planning and action. Brief action plans were developed by each team, with modest funds from UNITE. Working together, faculty discussed common readings, brought consultants to work with them, and tried out ideas. Twice yearly, all participants came together and shared their work with the other teams.

After the PDS program had run for 3 years, a new interdisciplinary team of 12 to 14 faculty formed voluntarily. This PDS Documentation

Team organized itself to provide current, useful feedback to each PDS site through snapshots gathered in a series of interviews at each location. While on a sabbatical leave afforded time, I conducted the interviews at one of the elementary sites and wrote the subsequent draft and final reports circulated to the school. Study teams allow faculty to pursue personal and organizational goals simultaneously and in the process develop a common set of values in the community.

Nurturing Relationships With External Mentors, Coaches, & Friendly Critics

Establishing long-term, sustained relationships with interested experts external to the local context has been another useful method for continuing our professional growth and changing our culture. Through the Adams bequest, we have brought nationally recognized scholars to work with SOE faculty on such topics as diversity, active learning, and collaborative inquiry. The experts were used in various ways: in large, campus-wide, public presentations, as centerpieces for day-long conferences, and in meetings with faculty study groups at the SOE, PDS sites or informal meals. These individuals have served as thoughtful advisers, friendly critics, and caring mentors for the faculty and for me, supporting continued learning in the community.

Belonging to External Networks & Creating Regional Networks of Our Own

Active participation in national and regional networks where group members are focused on needs, strategies, and content for major reform provides outside support and resources essential to bringing about significant change. McLaughlin's findings regarding the power of professional networks to promote continued growth for teachers is equally true for education faculty and deans like me, struggling to integrate reform.

Participation in UNITE has provided impetus and structure for the faculty's and my professional development and for the ongoing reform of our programs. Membership in UNITE has brought us intellectual, psychological, and fiscal support and resources. We have discovered how other deans and faculty leaders are facing similar challenges, shared strategies, learned more about the content essential to the reform, and received funds to advance this work. For example, the UNITE emphasis on the responsibility of SCDEs in preparing educators who are willing and competent practitioners with children in poverty, particularly in urban

centers has prompted us to establish a PDS partnership with the Indianapolis Public Schools, in spite of the logistics involved in bringing together two large, complex organizations separated by considerable distance.

The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) at Teachers College, Columbia University, with reform efforts focused on PDS relationships between universities and public schools, is another example of our participation in a national network. The director of ISU's PDS program, representatives from PDS sites, and I serve on NCREST's Planning Committee. NCREST allows us to share our work with leaders in PDS reform, support for travel to NCREST meetings, and resources for implementation of campus-based regional conferences promoting PDS relationships.

We have also created our own regional network by sponsoring an annual PDS conference at ISU. Teams of university-PDS site partners from Indiana and neighboring states are invited for one-day interaction with the keynote speaker (often drawn from the UNITE and NCREST groups), other teams, and presenters from other settings.

Visiting Innovative Sites, Having Dinners and Retreats Together

Supported by research on adult learners, our experience indicates that faculty enjoy learning and talking together about their work when opportunities for professional growth are combined with social activities. To increase our collective potential for learning and for sustaining our efforts for change, we have used forums which combine social and professional development, such as one-day retreats on- and off-campus, lunch and dinner meetings, and field trips to schools and universities engaged in reform. Most SOE departments were represented on these visiting teams, frequently, by volunteering faculty who had been in the SOE many years. A smaller team was supported to visit the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and its PDS sites, an idea initiated by faculty. Twenty-one faculty and I went to Indianapolis to meet with our new PDS partners over dinner the first evening and visit the PDS sites the following day.

Invitations to these sorts of activities are sent to all SOE faculty. If the climate and culture are changing and will continue to change, all faculty must know they are always invited to more fully participate in the community. Activities such as these require a modest investment of one-time monies, but they pay off in multiple ways, as faculty goals become more closely yoked with the SOE goals for a learning community.

Developing & Periodically Reassessing Mission, Goals, & Programmatic Outcomes

After faculty have begun to share a more common agenda, a process to review and update a school of education's mission and goals can further educate and concentrate reform efforts. "Ready, fire, aim," Fullan's now-famous advice, was the sequence we used in the SOE, although with more serendipity and less intention at the time. Our revised mission and goals document spoke clearly to our commitment to work in long-term partnerships with PDS sites, including assisting schools with ongoing staff development—a goal not part of earlier missions. Since our first endeavor at revising the SOE mission and related goals, which had not been revisited for many years, we have repeated Fullan's sequence.

Given the SOE's efforts during recent years focused on six reform themes and the Indiana Professional Standards Board's adoption of performance-based standards and assessment, I have recently charged a schoolwide committee to review, in light of these influences, the conceptual framework of the school's educator preparation programs and to make recommendations for revision as necessary. This step is one which moves from the horizontal approaches for brainstorming, discussion, and experimentation across the school toward vertical approaches, systematically imbedding desirable changes into all programs of the school. The cycle repeats itself: a period of learning and experimentation is followed by actions which ensure that new features become institutionalized and less effective ones discarded, thereby assuring that all students may benefit from the better ideas.

Defining the Role of the Professoriate in ISU's Contemporary School of Education

Another vertical approach was begun by my charging a schoolwide task group, the Role of the Professoriate (ROP) Committee, to define the professoriate's role in our contemporary school of education, recommend principles for faculty performance, and suggest methods of assessment. After discussion, feedback, and revision of the initial draft, the guidelines will be used to support promotion, tenure, and pay-for-performance decisions schoolwide, acknowledging differences and distinctions within departments. There is a need for greater clarity within the SOE and for improved communication regarding the SOE's expectations for faculty with the larger campus community. This step, recommended by the faculty in the SOE's strategic plan, marks the first time in the SOE's history that faculty will have come to a level of understanding and

agreement about the role and principles for faculty performance schoolwide. The Role of the Professoriate Committee used the revised SOE mission and goals document as the basis for describing the changed role of the professoriate. We hope to redefine the professoriate in a manner that will recognize, support, and reward the activities of the new culture in the school. Our learning community will be significantly strengthened by linking organizational and individual faculty goals.

Making Inquiry a Habit of Mind

Collaborative inquiry (CI) research projects—another form of sustained joint work designed and carried out between SOE and PDS site faculty—increasingly have become a regular part of *the way we do business.* Twenty-two such CI projects are underway or completed. They study such areas as the effects of all 9th graders taking algebra (instead of being tracked to lower-level math courses) and the use of portfolios as a form of alternative assessment in the middle grades. SOE Adams bequest funds support a visiting professor to work with the CI teams and the CI interdisciplinary faculty study group.

Getting the CI aspect of the PDS work integrated into the culture was at first a frustrating, slow process. In retrospect, this plodding pace was predictable and understandable, as inquiry about classroom work has not traditionally been part of either school or SOE culture. As the value of CI became more evident, the number and quality of the proposals brought for approval to the PDS Steering Committee have increased Modest funds—$400 per project and a maximum pool available of $6,000 per year—are available through university support. Several studies have resulted in regional and national joint conference presentations and some publications.

The PDS Documentation Team is another example of sustained collaborative inquiry. Interviews at each PDS site in spring 1995 provide a snapshot of the status of PDS reform efforts in the school. Our students and faculty can draw upon these studies to better understand the unique aspects of each PDS site and to increase their effectiveness in working and learning at the school. Furthermore, five papers were presented by the Documentation Team at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. The combined local application and national recognition reinforce the importance of collaborative inquiry to the SOE and PDS sites.

Our community goal is to have inquiry be a habit of mind for our faculty, PDS colleagues, and students. We want collaborative inquiry to become an integral part of our teaching and service.

Fashioning an Inviting & Inclusive Physical Environment

Our physical environment has changed to better convey the work of the school to our students, our visitors, and ourselves. I worked with a small faculty committee, the SOE associate dean, and the administrative assistant to change the school's image. We sought to convey the new learning community, its intellectual and collaborative focus, and a better environment for learning. We were assisted by an interior designer borrowed from the university's home economics department. He received a line on his vita, a letter of commendation, and a modest stipend. We received his professional advice, plans and blueprints, rolls of donated wallpaper and upholstery fabric, and a new environment.

Formerly, our first floor could have been the first floor of any unit on the campus. Now, near both entrances, signs and brightly painted logos proclaiming, "Educators Shape the Future," greet visitors. A kiosk with photos of faculty and students at work in varied settings is in the center of the floor. With the dark paneling painted, the interior appears brighter and more welcoming.

The 11th floor—the central gathering place, housing a large conference room, faculty lounge and mailboxes, reception area, and deans' offices—has changed dramatically. Poster-sized photos of faculty and students in action line the hallways. A large floor-to-ceiling wall area features 10x12 photos, telling the evolving story of the SOE's PDSes and including photos of faculty from each of the PDS sites. The display is labeled "Professional Development Schools—Building Communities of Learners."

Nearby, "SOE Schedule of Events" cases, detailing speakers and activities, remind everyone of upcoming special activities available in the school. Portable display boards near elevators and in the faculty lounge provide information on the work of study groups. One of the most popular features of the renovation is a series of specially built cases, located in the reception area of the floor, which house faculty members' current publications and awards. The increasing value of inquiry and research thoughtfully integrated with teaching and service is implicit and evident in these artifacts.

The refurbished conference room can now be sub-divided into three breakout rooms and has the latest multimedia equipment. It has become a popular meeting spot for SOE faculty and student groups, the president and Board of Trustees, and PDS faculties.

Our place is now a more inviting space to visit, work, and learn. Its walls tell the story of a school on the move, an environment committed to inquiry, teaching, and joint work, and a culture reinventing itself.

A Snapshot: The School of Education NOW

A key element of change in the culture has been that faculty here work together, not in isolation from one another, by coaching, teaching, learning in pedagogically-focused study groups, and serving as friendly critics for the work they are doing. As one of the faculty group chairs said, "We will be engaged in a process that has potential for restructuring the work of SOE faculty. That is, we will be working collaboratively on issues of concern and, in the process, becoming for each other a critical community" (W. Smith, 1995).

Working with faculty and students at the PDS sites has become part of the fabric of our professional lives. The initial 10 PDS sites have become working partners. To provide large city, urban school experience for our teacher candidates and our faculty, we have expanded our PDS partnership to include five inner-city Indianapolis schools. The PDS Steering Committee, composed of representatives from each PDS site and each SOE department, has been a innovative yet steady factor in bringing significant cultural change.

As a faculty, we look different. The numbers of men and women are more evenly balanced. About a third of the 78 members of the 1990 faculty have retired within the past 6 years. New faculty, for whom we advertised and recruited specifically for the SOE's new collaboratively-focused PDS work, have replaced them, and many are among the faculty leaders pushing for further reform. Members of minority groups are more prevalent, though still not in sufficient numbers. For the first time in the school's 125-year history, women chair two of its six current departments, and I was the first woman to serve as dean.

A Learning Community: Benchmarks of Change

Nurturing Community: Taking Root

My first year as dean, 1991-92, had been one of intense activity, often making me feel as though I was on an emotional roller-coaster, working both horizontally and vertically, both inside the university and with the public schools.

During summer 1992, most of our original 10 PDS sites had applied for IN 2000 designation, with the assistance of on-site restructuring committees and SOE faculty who typically served on them. During the following 15 months in stiff state competition, all 10 were designated IN 2000 schools, more schools than in any other comparable region in the state, and received funding from the Indiana Department of Education.

In early fall, the Indiana Commissioner for Higher Education commented publicly that ISU's SOE was the only school of education in the state providing professional development for teachers and schools in a systematic way. The powerful state teacher's union, the Indiana State Teachers Association, also began to take positive notice, asking me to write an article about ISU's PDS program for its quarterly newspaper.

Building Community: Early Evidence and Artifacts of Cultural Change

In fall 1992, the PDS Steering Committee began to meet regularly. The group recommends policy to the four superintendents and me as the dean, but in reality their work extends to such areas as PDS staff development plans and collaborative inquiry projects; formulating policy, and addressing a wide range of collaborative issues. Because the representatives—mainly teachers with a few administrators—are from elementary, middle, and secondary PDS sites and the SOE representatives include all departments, the mixture of perspectives, the richness of the dialogue, and their professional growth through the process have been remarkable. As a unique, *cross-cultural group*, their discussions have been far-ranging and often eye-opening for me and for them. The topics have included alternative, performance-based assessment; new scheduling models and patterns for use of time; middle and secondary schools becoming more like elementary schools (e.g., with groups of teachers being responsible for relatively small numbers of students and knowing them better); strategies and support for students with special needs; methods to actively engage more learners in learning; and ways PDS site faculty interact with SOE students and faculty.

Traditionally, teachers were usually polite and helpful to a point, but not engaged with university students. Now the PDS site representatives reported that teachers felt a greater sense of ownership and responsibility for SOE students now that their schools were PDS sites. They saw it as their job to provide careful planning and feedback to SOE students and faculty. The teachers felt a greater freedom and a responsibility to express their opinions freely to SOE faculty during planning and evaluation of the field experience. These are precisely the kinds of reactions and results that we had aimed for through the PDS program. A change in *how we do business* was occurring.

Another turning point in our interaction with public school faculty happened when the NCATE team arrived in March 1993. We scheduled a meeting of the PDS Steering Committee so that NCATE members could learn of the SOE's collaboration with schools as called for in

the NCATE standards. Two SOE faculty members, with background in traditional measurement and evaluation methods, presented the evaluation instruments they had designed for the PDS program to the committee for their review. They were planning to send the evaluation forms to the schools the following week.

After they finished, a high school teacher told the two seasoned professors that their instruments did not adequately capture the PDS program's fundamental concepts and goals. She added that their quantitative questions about school lunches and test scores were not evaluating the primary aims. Other PDS representatives chimed in. The evaluation form was long and the questions required too much time to properly answer. The professors tried to defend their work. I shifted uncomfortably in my seat, longing for the previous meaty, interdisciplinary conversations.

But later I learned the NCATE members had loved the interaction. The NCATE initial accreditation found that ISU met all 18 standards at both the beginning and advanced levels, the first comprehensive public university in Indiana to do so during NCATE's first 5-year cycle. In addition, NCATE cited the PDS partnership as a major strength of the university's educator preparation programs.

A third indicator of cultural and community change was the fall 1993 meeting with the Board of Trustees about the PDS program. By this time, our students had multiple experiences with the PDS program throughout their preparation. About half the SOE faculty had become fixtures of the PDS initiative through working at PDS sites in planning parts of courses, field experiences, and staff development; serving on school restructuring committees; working with PDS site principals; engaging in collaborative inquiry projects; or serving on the PDS Steering Committee. The Board of Trustees again soundly endorsed the initiative, seemed genuinely proud of what had transpired, and remain interested in and supportive of our progress to this day.

Supporting Community: Local, State, & National Funding & Recognition

Garnering external funding and support around the primary purpose for the PDS consortium are other signs of cultural change. The Lilly Endowment, Inc., provided steady support throughout this time. We met periodically with program officers to discuss how our newest ideas might mesh with the endowment's agenda.

Two of the endowment's officers became mentors for me—colleagues outside my immediate arena with whom I could sound out ideas and strategies. During these years, I became very active in the state, chairing

both the newly-formed, politically hot Indiana Professional Standards Board and the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. In both cases, I regularly drew upon the SOE's work of partnering with public schools through the PDS program. Teams of PDS site and SOE faculty met with both groups to talk about the partnership, thus ISU's PDS program became well known across the state. Throughout this time, the perspectives and support of these program officers, my coaches, were invaluable to me in these state roles.

I introduced the Lilly officers to national education reform leaders I knew and respected. At the same time, the program officers sought to link ISU's PDS program to national reform efforts the endowment was supporting, such as NCREST and UNITE, so that Indiana would be more closely tied to these initiatives. Internal and external funding support continued. Monetary support from the university continued as well, with various PDS activities integrated into the SOE's ongoing, line-item budget. Recently, the Endowment awarded another grant to support the PDS expansion to Indianapolis and to tie performance standards to the PDS work. New state Goals 2000 monies are another source, bringing to ISU's 15 PDS sites more than half the monies available statewide. Despite budget cutbacks, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) funded a proposal submitted by a team of SOE, College of Arts and Sciences, and PDS faculty.

External funding and recognition are not only catalysts for changing the community but also symbols of the kind of community we want to be. The school is increasingly part of a wider set of intersecting networks. Our work within our local partnerships informs and is informed by our links with associations, projects, and consortia within and outside the state. The various forms of support both enable and enhance the interactive and connected norms that guide our work.

Expanding Community: The President, Provost, & Superintendents of Schools

Key institutional leaders—university presidents, provosts, and superintendents of schools—have come to understand the implications of our direction; intervened at strategic moments with political, structural, or financial support; and engaged in the sometimes prolonged deliberations necessary to bring people and resources together.

The university president and provost referred regularly to the PDS partnership as a model for the entire university. They cited it in the university's strategic plan to encourage more such partnerships. A session in the president's Community Breakfast Series and the first to be pre-

sented off-campus was held at Chauncey Rose Middle School, one of our most successful PDS sites. The president, the provost, the superintendent of the local schools, PDS site teachers and principals, SOE faculty and students gave the presentation. It was a great upper for all of us and demonstrated the importance of deans working with university leaders, assisting them in using innovative, collaborative models like the PDS program for the benefit of the wider community.

I feel especially fortunate to be working with a president and a provost who value so highly the PDS partnership and the work of the SOE and say so publicly in many forums. Another example of the university administration's ongoing public support occurred soon after November 1994, when the local community elected new, more conservative members to the school board. With the hope of off-setting any potential discord about the PDS consortium with its ties to IN 2000—already a target for conservatives in the state—I talked with the superintendent shortly after the election. I suggested that we make a presentation to the school board to educate them early about the PDS program and, as a subcategory, IN 2000. We would include results from the schools to date. The superintendent liked the idea and invited me to lead a team of university and school representatives in a presentation at the next board meeting.

It was a cold, blustery winter evening. Sick with a terrible head cold, I felt markedly better when the university president appeared and sat down beside me—a complete surprise! He had talked with the superintendent at an event that morning, learned of our meeting with the school board, and cleared his evening schedule to help us make the case.

The school board had a follow-up meeting about IN 2000 and the PDS partnership, with the schools involved expressing strong support for the programs. To my knowledge, the topic has not been a target since. Once again we demonstrated the culture we have been forging collectively is actually something that benefits the larger learning community.

During these years, the county superintendent regularly declared his deepening commitment to the PDS program community. He has on many occasions gone the extra mile to be with us as a unified community. I have done the same on the superintendent's behalf. I believe for both of us our roles have changed in these years and now incorporate broader goals shared by the learning community we have helped to shape.

Enriching Community: Indianapolis PDS

We had become increasingly convinced that to have willing, competent, and successful teachers in urban settings, we as faculty must better understand the conditions and challenges of urban schools, incorporate

appropriate preparation into our programs, and provide our students multiple experiences in urban PDS settings. So in 1994, we began discussions with the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) to identify about five inner-city schools as possible PDS partners.

After meetings with top administrators, teams of principals and faculty from our initial PDS sites, faculty and chairs from the SOE, and representatives from Indianapolis sites, five sites—two elementary, one middle, and two high schools—joined ISU's PDS partnership. Although distance and logistics were challenging because the city is about a 90-minute drive from campus, SOE faculty visited the sites regularly, students have had meaningful field experiences, and other PDS activities such as restructuring committees, grant writing, and funding are underway.

The expansion of the PDS partnership to include Indianapolis also provided increased visibility for the university in the state's capital and largest city. To formally announce the ISU-IPS partnership, I participated in a press conference, along with the university president, the new superintendent of IPS, and others, held at a PDS site there. Articles about the PDS program appeared in Indianapolis newspapers, spots were shown on TV, and a large photo of our president talking with a group of African American students at the PDS site who were interested in becoming teachers was featured in ISU campus and alumni newspapers.

A Learning Community: The Dean Continues to Learn

As dean, my part in changing the SOE culture and climate has involved the simultaneous application of horizontal and vertical strategies. Horizontally, I have promoted collaboration, brainstorming, and experimentation with new ideas across departmental and hierarchical boundaries. Change begins to occur from the ground up, across the unit, as ideas are shared and attempted. At the same time, I have worked within the hierarchical or vertical structures of the institution, especially in policy decisions. The process of gaining and keeping approval from departments, SOE and university governing committees, administrative bodies, the Teacher Education Committee, and, perhaps, the university Board of Trustees is ultimately about implementing and institutionalizing reforms.

Linking reform in schools with reform in the preparation of educators is at the heart of the community we wanted to become. Moving towards this norm has been an enjoyable, intellectually stimulating, and daunting challenge. I have tried to provide a visible leadership role in nearly all of the change strategies while continuously working with others to foster their growth and leadership in effecting change. Planning and working

with faculty teams throughout the process, I have usually remained an involved, hands-on player actively promoting and leading the effort to incorporate reform into university programs.

Change continues to come from all directions. The new university president and the provost have also generated multiple projects and committees where the SOE faculty and I have been closely involved. The campus has become a lively, interactive place.

The Indiana Professional Standards Board, of which I remain a member, has adopted new performance-based standards and assessment requirements for Indiana educators. A complete revision of current licensing rules for all educators will occur. Sustained university-school collaboration will be necessary to bring the changes needed. However, ISU's PDS reform initiatives and strategies have placed the SOE, as part of an expanded learning community, in an advantageous position to support and embrace continued change.

What have I learned? How have I changed? Last year, my work as dean was evaluated through a comprehensive series of interviews by an external consultant. The evaluation documented that with my leadership, in the view of many people, considerable positive change has occurred and has been embraced by the majority of the greater SOE learning community. It also indicated that a sizable number of faculty in the SOE graduate programs believed that too much attention had been on undergraduate teacher preparation. They felt disenfranchised and worried that their work was not valued. While I could list numerous, sound reasons in defense of my conscious actions in setting the SOE's direction, the fact that so many felt this way was important for me to hear.

In reflecting on my values and beliefs as a leader-teacher, how could I lead a supportive, interactive learning community with a portion of the participants feeling left out? We have made organizational changes which will bring attention to concerns about graduate programs. I will remain publicly and personally involved in monitoring the effectiveness of our changes. In heeding the concerns expressed by these faculty, I believe conditions may have been created that increase the likelihood of their greater participation in the SOE's overall change efforts.

I continue to have faith and confidence that collectively, through learning and working together, we will determine our goals and figure out better solutions to problems which challenge us. It is the process and the evidence that improvement is occurring that keep us intellectually alive.

I am concerned that faculty who are the primary change agents are overloaded. Junior faculty are concerned that service of this nature may not really be valued in promotion and tenure, although the evidence on

ISU's campus does not support their fears. Resisters and nonparticipants remain, although we have successfully worked to sustain a critical mass of support to change our culture from the earliest PDS planning days.

I seek a greater balance in my life regarding time and attention for family and hobbies, and, on the other, the challenge and satisfaction I receive through my work. John Kennedy advised that leaders should surround themselves with the most able, talented people they can find. The wonderfully talented ones help everyone else look better, including the leader. Taking a somewhat different stance, Philip Schlecty once commented that we plow the fields with the horses we have. Putting people in positions where their particular expertise works to support the school's goals is important. Hiring new faculty and chairs with ability and commitment to foster community initiatives enhances momentum. Fundamentally, identifying the strengths of all participants in the community, and supporting their continued growth so that their talents continue to evolve, remains a high priority. I am deeply appreciative of the bright, competent, gifted, and delightful people with whom I have the privilege to work.

Together, the faculty and I have worked to create a learning community that supports and renews itself while its members embrace and lead efforts to bring still further change. As dean, and as a teacher-learner, my role has been to facilitate, support, and nudge the learning of the expanded SOE community. I remain hopeful that through our efforts, learning is improved for university students, public school pupils, and prospective teachers, as we as their teachers continue to grow and learn.

References

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* New York: Carnegie.

Clifford, G. J. and Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed School: A brief for professional Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., and Talbert, J. E. (Eds.) (1993). *Teaching for Understanding.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L., Griffin, G., and Wise, A. (1992). *Excellence in teacher education: Helping teachers develop learner-centered schools.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession.* New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change 2nd Ed.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: an anatomy of leadership.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gregory, T. and Smith, G. (1987). *High schools as communities: The small school reconsidered.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Holmes Group, The. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Lanier, J. E. and Featherstone, J. (1988). *A new commitment to teacher education. Educational Leadership, 46,* no. 3, pp. 18-22.

Lieberman, A. (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now.* Falmer.

Lieberman, A. (1995). *The work of restructuring schools: Building from the ground up.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco and Oxford: Jossey-Bass.

Schlecty, P. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sirotnik, K. A. and J. I. Goodlad. (1988). *School-university partnerships in action.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). *Horace's school redesigning the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, W. E. Unpublished. *Memo to faculty on PDS Documentation Team.* (1995) School of Education, Indiana State University.

Addressing the Dean's Dilemma

Sam J. Yarger

Explaining the dean's role in radically changing programs in a school of education is tricky business, and is sure to be confusing. If a school or college has made truly dramatic change, a factual explication of the dean's role could create major problems in his or her academic unit. Deans, unfortunately, cannot always be public about how they achieve their goals. Fundamental to this problem is the well-entrenched, longstanding myth that deans don't change programs and schools—faculty do. The irony of this myth is that, left to their own devices, most faculties work industriously to maintain the status quo. Thus the dilemma facing the dean who perceives the need to create change emerges—only the faculty, not the dean, can do it, but the faculty don't really want to do it all.

Yet instance after instance could be presented of all of the changes that have occurred, and dramatic new structures and programs that have emerged. So how it is possible in the late 1990s that schools of education and their programs look dramatically similar to my first university appointment in the late 1960s?

This dilemma does not play out as simply as it is stated. The dean doesn't just declare to the faculty that henceforth the school of education will change from this to that. Instead, the dilemma directs a strategy whereby the dean attempts to promote change without ever being viewed as the initiator, or even as a primary player. Deans may seed the environment with ideas, or wait until a sound idea is presented, and then support it in any way that he or she can. Additionally, deans attempt to anticipate problems and the required resources to deal with them efficiently.

I have worked in change-oriented programs at four institutions in varied roles —professor, associate dean, and dean. This chapter reflects the issues and problems encountered over the years rather than as a case study of a single institution. The problems delineated will be viewed by the reader to be much clearer and more precise than the solutions provided. The reason is simple. I don't have clear and simple solutions for many of the problems that I encountered while trying to guide a school of education through a change process.

Problem 1—"No, I'm not really interested in changing, but I'll never admit it."

Most of the problems that deans encounter when attempting to engineer major program change relate to the faculty, which is to be expected. Faculties, in conjunction with the students they attract, form the corpus of the university and represent the overwhelming majority of what that institution represents. Faculties rarely rally around anything, with the exception of opposition to the dreaded administration. It's not unusual to work with a faculty and develop a sound, coherent plan for change. It's also not unusual to believe that everyone agrees with it. Some faculty believe that a statement of commitment is sufficient; someone else will do the work. Thus, translating that universally accepted plan into a living, breathing program is often fraught with problems.

Interestingly, the real problem is usually not those faculty members who argue, debate, and constantly raise questions. Those faculty are engaged and are entitled to have a voice in determining how the program will develop. The problem frequently focuses on those faculty who say very little, yet appear to be agreeing with what everyone else's wishes. However, when the time arrives to develop that radical new syllabus, the result looks suspiciously like the original. When the time arrives to work in P-12 schools with teachers and teacher education students on a new, intense, and regular basis, all sorts of scheduling problems arise that preclude faculty involvement. The frustrating aspect of this is that no one had any idea that these faculty were not on the same wavelength as their colleagues. Perhaps their silence should have signaled the dean that a problem was brewing.

Given the strong press in U.S. teacher education for change and reform, it is "professionally correct" to want change. When faculty members have endorsed a new program, but have exhibited neither enthusiasm nor skepticism, simply approval, then the problems that emerge can be substantial.

Often, faculty members who represent this position are not regarded as leaders. The reason for that is simple. Most deans recognize who the leaders are and have already worked with them to ensure their commitment to the process. Thus, one frequently ends up with the leadership and a cadre of often younger faculty members wanting to move ahead, while a group of often veteran faculty are reluctant to become engaged.

This problem must be addressed, or the "new-and-improved" program may be doomed from the start. Sometimes all it takes is the creation of an environment that is conducive to an open exchange of

information and opinions, one where the reluctant faculty members do not feel threatened or devalued. Once these faculty members have an opportunity to voice their concerns, share their reluctance, and perhaps even acknowledge their fears, they are less likely to create roadblocks as the new program unfolds, although they might not fully engage themselves in the change process. A faculty member can even be "turned around" to become involved in the change process.

The sad truth is that there are likely to be a few faculty members, perhaps still not acknowledging that they don't want to change, who will never support a new program idea. While these faculty members must be acknowledged and to some extent accommodated, they cannot be allowed to derail their colleagues' efforts. In this instance, accommodation usually means an unspoken agreement that reluctant faculty will be left alone if they do not impede the change process. Obviously, if this group forms a majority of the faculty, a radical rethinking of the new program would perhaps be necessary. That, however, is typically not the case.

For deans and others who initiate and support program change within a school of education, this first problem is part of an ongoing need to weather the varied responses and cycles of acceptance and rejection throughout a change process. Within the wider demand however, lies a potential source of opposition not always anticipated or detected—namely those who are against the reform but do not admit it openly sometimes even to themselves. A dean must learn to read the silent signs of dissent and to invent situations and strategies which bring their voices to the table and a name to those concerns that jeopardize their involvement in the change. Only then can a plan to address this problem be developed.

Problem II—"I'm a serious scholar committed to my field—and need the time and space to pursue my academic interests."

Young professors, fresh out of graduate school, are likely to begin their first job with a very simple and wholly inadequate understanding of what it is they will be doing for a living. After all, they've learned that the "three-legged stool" that defines the professoriate's role requires that they perform and report research, teach, and provide service to the profession (whatever that means). Most young professors expect and embrace the expectation that they will develop a line of inquiry, understand the importance of instructing students well, and are fully prepared to serve on university committees and in their state and national organizations. Yet

there has been a great willingness to overlook the fact that, especially in research institutions, the research leg of the stool is much thicker and longer than the others, and the service leg of the stool is almost invisible. While lip service is given to the teaching leg of the stool, most will acknowledge that we really don't know how to evaluate good teaching at the university level, and therefore don't try very hard.

Increasingly, however, both novitiate and veteran faculty members are confronting an environment that they are told must change dramatically, must become more efficient, and must serve students better. What this means in terms of role and behavioral changes is rarely thought about and not clearly understood. The problem focuses on changing from a poorly defined role to one that has not even been delineated.

Much of the dramatic change being called for in schools of education focuses on improved and more relevant *professional* programs for both beginning and experienced teachers. The demands of program development in this area can (and often does) conflict with the professional roles that professors have constructed for themselves. Succinctly, the "preferred" role emphasizes individual scholarship while the "expected" role emphasizes schools, students and professional training. The conflict can be enormous and can create distinct tension in the relationships that support any academic unit. The obvious (and simplistic) solution to this problem demands a restructuring of the manner in which the academic unit operates.

In most cases, it is probably not wise to attempt to dramatically alter the unit's organizational structure to accommodate change. Rather, the emphasis should be on an overhaul of the way in which people interact as well as a rethinking of the existing norms for professional behavior. If new interactive processes and norms for professional behavior are well articulated, the faculty are provided with the opportunity to either initially define or to ultimately redefine their role. Obviously, much of the responsibility for creating the environment that allows new interaction processes to emerge, and new norms to develop rests with the dean.

One of the communication strategies that I've found helpful, and it does seem to change the norm, is to increase the willingness of all involved in a change process to accept outside help. I found that by simply modeling this behavior, I've been able to influence the behavior of others. The outside help may come from the traditional consultant, perhaps one that has been involved in a change process similar to the one that is being implemented, or it may come from other sources. Classroom teachers, principals, curriculum specialists, and others can all be sources of outside help in the program development process. It should be

pointed out that this is often not easy to accomplish, as a well-established traditional program is nearly immune to outside influences.

It has been said of professors that teaching is the second most private act they engage in (perhaps for some it is the first). The notion of the isolated professor working with a group of students is incongruous to a real change process. Rather, there must be a focus on interaction and communication. If one remains isolated while trying to change one's behavior, it is very easy to become discouraged and fearful. If, however, one can share with others the problems they are encountering, their attempts to solve them, and solicit ideas for improving what they are doing, then a great deal can be accomplished. This type of interaction, however, is hardly a normal activity for college faculty. Thus it is incumbent on the dean to create an environment as well as an opportunity for interaction and communication that focuses on the newly emerging roles in program change. Brown bag lunches, faculty forums, frequent area or specific topic meetings and a host of often easy- to-arrange events can all help in this process. If this can be accomplished, it can actually serve as a reward for risk-taking, because it can be shown that taking a new and different position does not have to result in something bad.

A professor's commitment to an academic content area sometimes conflicts with the need to present a coherent program. This conflict is usually played out in the "academic freedom" arena. Some faculty members, for either academic, ideological or personal reasons, become so attached to a particular idea or approach to teaching, that they are unable to accommodate other concepts and approaches. Unfortunately, rather than taking the time and putting forth the effort to acknowledge a competing point of view and integrate it into a program, professors in this situation often decry the validity of the other point of view and take the position that one approach is "right" while the other is "wrong." Attempts to ameliorate the situation raise the cry that "academic freedom" is being violated. An individual's motivation for involvement in this type of situation is often hard to discern. It might reflect a "true belief;" it might be ideological, plain stubbornness, or an excuse for avoiding the change process. Regardless, if ignored, it can damage a reform effort.

The long conflict between program coherence and academic freedom has not been solved primarily because it has not been recognized as an important problem. Many professors don't even believe the problem exists, yet all too often they refuse to give up "academic freedom," thus sabotaging the spirit of cooperation that is necessary in a program. Interestingly, this problem is more often important in the field of

education than in many other professions because the profession itself is very loosely defined.

Because education in general, and teacher education specifically, are not well defined, the relationship of specific courses to the practice of teaching is often difficult to discern. For example, deciding between a token economy or cooperative learning approach is more than a simple selection of educational strategies. It is the choice between polar opposite approaches to human behavior. Not only are they incompatible, they are contradictory. Consequently, there is a need to exercise more control over the development and maintenance of a teacher education program so that those delivering the program know exactly what has been taught, and that students are not confused or misled.

The same is true for the development and monitoring of laboratory and clinical experiences. The practice of teaching often leads to results that are far less predictable than practice in other professions. Physicians can, in most instances, quite accurately predict what is going to happen as they initiate a surgical procedure. Experienced teachers, on the other hand, while they can offer a pretty good idea about the direction a lesson will take, are far less sure about the exact outcomes. Thus, we have the situation where more programmatic control is needed, and the need for coherence is evident. Otherwise, a program is likely to appear random and confusing to students.

A different but related problem focuses on faculty's allegiance to specific content areas or fields rather than programs or institutions. It's easy to understand, as the professor's network of associates and intellectual stimulation is often found in his or her colleagues in that particular field. Carried to an unhealthy level, this leads to a different problem, namely an unhealthy lack of interest in any aspect of the program other than those related to that professor's particular intellectual interest (e.g., science education or language arts education). When this occurs, professors are less than 100 percent willing to work together to achieve a coherent program. It raises the question of "in what interest do they really work, their beliefs and their discipline, or the program and students with whom they are currently engaged?" Regardless of the answer to that question, it certainly does impede the development of program coherence and integrity, and it's more common than many of us would like to admit.

Perhaps this can best be understood within the context of the protection of careers through a change process. It is no secret among faculty that success in their careers is highly dependant on developing and promoting a line of scholarly productivity. And, while some adjustments

can be made in the criteria for career advancement, probably the wisest move the dean can make is to help the faculty maintain their scholarly orientation while engaging in a time-consuming and energy-draining process. This can be accomplished, for example, by the reduction of teaching load, mini-sabbaticals (three or four weeks), joint scholarly projects, and the provision of opportunities to have an outlet for one's work. If the dean can create an environment that allows communication patterns to be altered and new roles to emerge, there need not be any conflict between major program development and scholarly productivity.

These problems are typically longstanding and complex, thus resistant to "quick fixes." Often, the best approach is to simply bring them to the surface, ensure they are acknowledged, and then implore those charged with the responsibility for program development to work together, exhibiting as much sensitivity as possible. While this clearly will not solve the problems, it should establish situations where reasonable people can work through difficult situations.

An approach I've used on more than one occasion is to ensure that the assumptions that underlie a program or programmatic effort are clearly explicated and understood by everyone prior to the initiation of the program. By doing this, faculty members have the opportunity to register any problems they might have at an early stage, and to offer solutions that will allow the work to go forward. It will also provide the narrow, discipline-oriented professors the opportunity to discover or create their niche in the new program. While this is only a partial solution, it will enhance the opportunity for communication, thus allowing progress to be made.

Finally, to the extent possible, those charged with developing new programs should attempt to structure the process so that it is cooperative rather than competitive. The extent to which it is possible to make the success in one area of the program not only dependent on but complementary to the development of other program components, is the extent to which one is structuring for cooperative relationships. This is most achievable under circumstances where faculty members are cognizant of what a student has encountered prior to the current course, and equally cognizant of the fact that the next faculty member in the sequence will pick up and build on the current course content. One way to achieve this, though not a way that everyone will subscribe to, focuses on orienting the students to expect it by letting them know that they will be expected to demonstrate and explain the relationship of program components. Advance organizers, program orientations, and frequent seminars are all techniques that can be used to achieve this goal.

Problem III—"You want change—it's going to cost big bucks."

At a recent seminar convened in Washington, D.C., to analyze the rather dismal prospects of funding for educational research and program development in the foreseeable future, a veteran professor commented from the podium, "Those of you who are old enough, please think back to the way we did research and how we developed programs prior to 1957. Do you have that vision in mind? Well, that's the way we are going to be doing it in the future." The point that the professor was trying to make was that prior to the flight of Sputnik in 1957, there was virtually no external money available for either educational research or program development. Rather, professors, not missing what they never had, created quite an enviable record of both research and innovative programs—at least for that period. During the last 40 years, an interesting phenomenon has occurred. Most of the pre-1957 professors have retired. Thus, our schools of education are populated by professors who have only worked in a milieu where the possibility and the promise of external resources was present. This has lead to some very interesting situations.

For example, program developers in higher education frequently, maybe even typically, overestimate the importance of additional resources in their plans to reform their programs. This has lead to numerous situations where truly innovative and cutting-edge proposals are submitted to a funding agency, complete with a healthy budget. When the proposal, however, is not funded, one rarely, if ever, expects the program ideas to go forward. In essence, in modern-day education reform, we all too often link the reform agenda with the availability of external funds. In essence, we have raised, and are continuing to raise a generation of professors afflicted with education's version of "welfare dependency." "Grant award dependency" suggests that if there are no baskets of new money waiting to support visionary ideas, then these wonderful new programs cannot be implemented. The notion of reallocation of existing resources, or even reallocation of our own time and effort to achieve a new, more desirable goal, is becoming increasingly rare. It is simply too easy to cite lack of resources as a reason for not taking that dramatic step forward.

This phenomenon is not limited to dependency on an external source, it extends to resources from any source. So, even when proposals are not generated for an external funding agency, the idea of changing from program A to the new and better program B will likely be dependent, in the eyes of many, on the dean's ability to generate new and additional resources within the institution.

How, then, does the dean deal with the issue of new and additional resources in the reform and change process? The issue should be confronted directly, but not necessarily explicitly. The dean should announce, at the onset, that there will be, depending on the case, minimal, some, or no new resources to help the faculty change the program. It would probably be unwise to go into great detail concerning the institutional budget, because the skeptics will find many devils in those details. For example, the dean's secretary and graduate assistant, if sacrificed, could fund another position. The focus would then be on the resources, with too little energy devoted to the tasks at hand.

It's also very important to match the scope of the project to the resources that are or will be available. In other words, find out what is really needed to achieve the new programs' goals. Going through this process will not only allow everyone to acknowledge its feasibility, but it will also force those involved in change to confront any fuzzy thinking that may still exist. It is very likely that once the job to be accomplished has been matched to the available resources, that the faculty can see that lack of resources isn't the real problem.

There is also the obvious solution—give them what they want by generating new dollars. This may be easier in some institutional settings than others, but most deans have figured out ways to produce money when it is needed. For example, one can leave a faculty position vacant for a year, and generate some "one time" money. It's also often possible to divert resources from one project to another, particularly if the projects are in different stages of development. Looking for new economies in the operations of the unit may also be helpful. For example, I was able to generate nearly $40,000 a year by simply changing the phone system for the entire school of education. Each dean will have to figure out his or her own way to generate new resources. The point is that if it's money that is needed, at least on a one-time basis, it can usually be found.

Problem IV—"How can you trust someone who doesn't understand that the university is supposed to be democratically governed by the faculty?"

Shared governance, sometimes referred to as faculty governance, varies tremendously from institution to institution. Some smaller colleges exhibit very little of it, while some major research institutions make virtually no major decisions without first consulting the faculty. An understanding of shared governance requires that one break it down and look at discreet areas. For example, in matters of curriculum and aca-

demic programs, the faculty is usually seen as the primary governing source. In the area of academic personnel, i.e. the hiring and retention of faculty, it should truly be a shared relationship. In most instances, the faculty defines the position and implements the search-and-screen procedures, but must make a recommendation to the dean, who is the only person who can offer a faculty member a position. Finally, in matters of resource allocation, the administration typically has the primary responsibility. The problem is the areas tend to be blurred, because they are interrelated. Curriculum and academic program decisions clearly have fiscal ramifications, as do personnel decisions. By the same token, the allocation of resources has a clear impact on an institution's academic programs. For the system to function smoothly, the concept of "shared" must be understood by all parties, and the roles must be clearly articulated.

It's always amazed me how poorly the concept of shared governance is understood on a university campus. The initiation of a process to clarify shared governance procedures must come from the leadership. That does not mean that the dean can issue an edict about how the school operates. Rather, it means that it's incumbent upon the dean to start the discussion. One method is for the dean to convene a committee of faculty leaders with the purpose of writing a policy and procedures manual for the academic unit. Once completed, this document can be submitted to the faculty for critique, and finally for approval. It is important to be not only clear, but also complete in the development of a tool such as this, because omissions create vacuums, which can lead to discord.

Once the concepts are thoroughly understood (and hopefully accepted), it is important to delineate proper roles and responsibilities within the governance structure. When faculty and leadership roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined, then the shared governance system can be used to impede the change process and can come from either the faculty or from the leadership. The signs that this is occurring include:

- requests for an inordinate number of meetings, or for votes where votes are usually not taken;
- arguments springing up that make little sense, yet are not challenged; and
- "some people put their oar in the water enough to make waves, but not enough to pull their own weight," as one observer noted.

Gridlock, stalemate, and distorted programs are the result of a dysfunctional shared governance system. To avoid this situation, it is crucial that the unit's policy and procedures manual and its bylaws be central to the governance process. Everyone must understand the "who" and "what" of how the system operates. I know this sounds simple and benign, but it is surprising how many academics know little or nothing of these crucial details.

Even at its best, however, the most perfect governance system doesn't always lead to the right decisions. It is not unknown, for example, for faculty groups to create and approve an academic program that has so many requirements and so much "rigor" that the likelihood of recruiting students is nil. When that occurs, the role of the leadership is not to reject it, and certainly not to suggest an alternative. Rather, it is the dean's role to critique the work of the faculty and send it back to them for further consideration. It might also be wise to meet with the appropriate faculty bodies and discuss the issues under consideration, emphasizing the areas of most importance. It is also likely that a leadership decision, made within the context of shared governance can be a disaster—perhaps that new schoolwide computer network just doesn't work. The only way to handle a problem like this is to be open, candid, and get it fixed very quickly. Admitting mistakes can actually communicate an openness that is likely to minimize the fallout.

In managing a complicated governance system, there is one skill that an academic leader must excel at, the learned art of compromise. Judgment is also necessary, because even though compromise is important in a shared governance process, it would be irresponsible to allow a compromise to lead to poor decisions or low quality programs. Thus, the "non negotiable" criterion for arriving at a compromise is that the compromise does no damage to the academic unit or its programs.

Because faculty are so involved with the operation of an academic unit, there are many formal meetings, such as committees, departmental meetings, school or college meetings, the Faculty Senate, and so on. This has led over time to a standardization of communication patterns within this formal organization. Regardless of what the company line is, debate and open discussion are less present than one might think. What often replaces truly honest discourse is what I call *artificial collegiality*. Faculty meetings sometimes almost sound and appear like the highly structured and stilted discourse of Congress. It is not unusual for a professor to be recognized at a faculty meeting and make the most outrageous statement and not be challenged by anyone. Instead, artificial collegiality demands

that any opposition be based on a reason that would be deemed by observers to have the least political or emotional loading.

How many deans have found themselves in the "Lone Ranger" position of taking an unpopular but necessary position before the faculty and receiving no public support, then meeting afterward with a colleague and receiving a pat on the back and a whisper of support for the position taken? This not-uncommon phenomenon occurs because the unpopular position taken by the dean usually is unacceptable to one or more faculty members, and other faculty members are reluctant to support a position for fear that support will be viewed as offensive to a colleague. By the same token, if there is a scintilla of opposition to a deconal decision, and it is made public, there is a good chance that the opposition will grow. Unpopular deconal decisions, if they serve no other purpose, often help a faculty develop cohesiveness.

It is not unusual for faculty to refuse to support an administrative decision to change incompetent leadership in a program because the faculty "feel sorry" for the person involved. It's also not unusual for a faculty to continue to support a bankrupt program that a legitimate committee had determined was unacceptable because the professor made a personal plea for support. These examples and others like them all fall under the rubric of artificial collegiality.

Candor is the best antidote for artificial collegiality. Candor, of course, sometimes requires courage, and suggests that one confronts directly rather than by developing an obtuse argument. One way a dean can exhibit candor and help initiate a higher level discussion is by asking sensitive questions in a public forum (e.g., "After reading 50 recent dissertations, I'm concerned about their quality. Does anyone else share my concern?"), and encouraging his or her colleagues to respond. This approach calls for honest discourse, but does not require a faculty member to directly confront a colleague. Another strategy is to empower groups (committees) by asking them to address truly important problems or issues (e.g., Should the school of education terminate all undergraduate programs and become a graduate school of education?). The secret to making this strategy work is the crafting of a specific charge for the committee. If the parameters are clear, well-established, and publicly stated, it then becomes possible to hold the committee's "feet to the fire" and optimize the likelihood of an acceptable result.

In a more private way, a dean can also encourage faculty leaders to speak out on issues related to the welfare of the unit or its programs. If only one or two faculty members speak out publicly, yet honestly and persuasively, then others will be encouraged to do so as well. It's impor-

tant to remember that if and when this occurs, the faculty leaders should have the dean's support as well as an unstated pledge of non-opposition, even when the dean is opposed to the position being presented. Finally, the dean can encourage candor by supporting good decisions made by individual faculty members as well as faculty groups. This support should be clear and public, and the decision should not be subject to administrative critique, even if the leader did not totally support it. Remember, if the decision (perhaps a compromise) does no damage to the unit or the programs and represents the will of the faculty, then it probably should be honored.

Another talisman resulting from the formal procedures that characterize so much academic communication is a perpetual distrust of leadership. It might be a major or a minor problem, but it will always be present. Once when I was upset with the faculty after a meeting, a veteran provost told me that I should not be angry, because mistrust of the dean (or provost, president and so on) is endemic to higher education. He added that faculty members perceive deans and others to have a disproportionate control of their professional lives, and believe that they should receive 100 percent support since they play a central role in selecting their own leaders. Thus, every time a decision is made that some faculty members don't agree with, no matter how defensible it is, those faculty members tend to see their trust as having been violated. The provost ended the conversation with the statement, "You have to remember, these folks don't work for General Motors."

At a farewell party for a previous position, after 8 years of service, and an apparently congenial relationship with the faculty, I made the following statement in jest: "When I came here 8 years ago everyone was concerned about my hidden agenda, and, of course, I denied that I had one. Well, the truth of the matter is, I did have a hidden agenda, and it had eight objectives. I want you to know that I've achieved every one of them." With that I sat down expecting my colleagues to exhibit amusement at my little joke. Instead, I looked around the room and saw heads nodding in agreement. I had, in fact, affirmed what they had believed all along. Interestingly, no one ever asked me about the content of my "hidden agenda." The important point was that I had one.

Perhaps there is a "healthy" distrust of leadership that does go with the territory. After all, deans do not share all of the information they possess, by sheer necessity. But it is important to distinguish between withholding information and dishonesty with the faculty. They clearly are different. I have often told my colleagues, "I won't ever lie to you, but I also won't always be able to tell you everything I know." That

usually satisfies them and provides them with a standard to judge me by. Regardless, the structure of our academic institutions complete with its formal communication patterns probably make it impossible to escape the perception by many faculty that deans and other administrators are simply not to be trusted.

There are, of course, have been in the past, and will be in the future, deans and other leaders who should not be trusted. Who has not seen deans manipulate faculty members, particularly junior, untenured faculty members, to get what he or she wants? Sadly, some deans develop personal favorites among the faculty that influences the decisions they make. Some deans continually take the "easy road" to avoid conflict and tension, although it might be damaging to the unit or its programs.

Thus, while the distrust of leadership in higher education might not be totally eradicable, there are still things that deans can do to minimize the effect. Deans, for example, should be very visible to the faculty, as well as open and forthcoming in their work. Those who hide in offices staring at cathode-ray tubes are probably going to only enhance the feelings of distrust that are already evident. Obviously, deans should always be honest with their faculty colleagues. It would (and should) be a disaster for a dean to blame the provost or president for unpopular decisions, when the dean, in fact made them. That type of dishonesty, which unfortunately I have seen in the past, nearly always comes back to damage what is inherently an already fragile relationship between a dean and the faculty.

Another way a dean can help overcome the faculty's natural distrust is by creating support for the academic unit in the central administrative offices as well as the rest of the university community. Faculty are encouraged by statements from the provost, the president, and the leader of the faculty senate suggesting that they work in a strong school and are doing good deeds. A dean's effort in this area is also very clear evidence that he or she is working on behalf of the academic unit and the faculty. This cheerleading role should not be underestimated in terms of its importance to the faculty. It may seem trite, and it may even make a dean bite his or her tongue from time to time, but faculty do take notice.

In this same vein, an academic leader should never publicly criticize the academic unit, its programs, or its faculty, even if the criticism is accurate and/or deserved. If criticism of the unit must be presented to the central administration, it should be done in private, and with a pledge of confidentiality.

Conclusions

Elements of cynicism may have crept into some of my points. But it is a healthy cynicism is directed toward our system that promotes one set of values (e.g., collaboration, teaching, and school improvement), but rewards a very different set, such as publications (important or not), privacy and individualism, and unhealthy competition. A careful analysis, hopefully, will also show that the universal outcome of any of the strategies presented in this chapter result in a professional engagement of people that was inhibited by the problem. In the final analysis, the dean's real goal is to get people working together on common problems.

Is it true that faculty take the position that only faculty, not deans, change programs and schools, and work very hard to maintain the status quo? The dilemma probably does not exist as definitively as I've stated. Faculty and administrators typically don't choose up sides and engage in overt "you will, I won't" tugs of war. Regardless, all too often, one, two, or a small number of faculty assume that position, which leads to major gridlock for all. While it may or may not take a whole village to educate a child, it clearly does not take a whole faculty to bring good things to either a grinding halt or a distorted conclusion.

The dean's dilemma is very real one. The dean is usually the one expected to lead the school to bigger and better things—few deans are hired with the mandate to maintain the status quo. Thus, the dean's dilemma presents a ready-made tension between the dean and the faculty. The energy created by this tension can be directed either wisely or foolishly. The dean who can steer the tension-driven energy in the right direction is the dean who will be successful.

The list of traits that a dean must exhibit should not be surprising to anyone, as they represent the traits that any person wants in a leader—vision; integrity; perceptiveness; and the ability to foster communication, compromise, and work on behalf of the faculty and the school. Often the most indispensable attribute a dean can possess is that funny feeling in the pit of the stomach.

I hope that this chapter has demonstrated the schools of education are, indeed, dynamic organizations. Today's crises are tomorrow's memories. Conditions change, resources change, people change, all influencing the dynamic interaction of an academic unit. That certainly has to be one of higher education's virtues and the one that keeps me, and all of us, engaged.

Building Capacity for Change

Richard Arends

Overview

It is hard to separate deaning in a more general sense from deaning aimed at improvement and change. This is particularly difficult for me because I have viewed my job as dean (and my whole professional career, for that matter) as one of trying to make K-12 schools and schools of education more effective and more satisfying places for students to learn and for faculty to teach. As a result there is little that I do as dean that is not directed, in one way or another, toward improvement and change. However, like all administrators in higher education, I believe that my leadership is influenced largely by who I am as a person and the context in which I find myself at particular times.

I will describe what I have done over the past 5 years at Central Connecticut State University to help faculty design a new teacher education curriculum and create a network of professional development schools. Although I will write this in the first person and focus mainly on my role in this process, much of what has occurred has been the result of a much larger group of players, associate deans, faculty president, department chairs as well as many faculty who carried out key leadership roles and served on numerous committees and task forces over the past 5 years.

Setting the Context of My Deanship

I came to Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) in 1991. Central Connecticut is the oldest public institution in Connecticut, founded by Henry Barnard, who later became the first US Commissioner of Education. It progressed though the same stages as most institutions of its type—moving from a two-year normal school to a four-year teachers college and finally to a multipurpose, regional university.

Several features of the university's recent history are important to my story. One, an expansion of non-liberal arts and non teacher-preparation programs at CCSU occurred in the 1970s, particularly in the schools of business and technology. This expansion was driven partly by student

demand, but also by Connecticut State College's desire to obtain university status which was conferred in 1983. This trend continued into the 1980s when the school of business started to plan and offer graduate programs, when graduate programs were expanded significantly in the school of education, and when the school of technology was identified as a center of excellence by the university's Board of Trustees.

So when I assumed the deanship in 1991, I came to a school of education that had experienced a two-decade transfer of resources and prestige to other university programs. Like many schools of education in the United States, teacher education had lost its dominance as new graduate programs in education rose to prominence resulting in some faculty proclaiming their new status as "graduate-only faculty," meaning they were not involved with the preparation of teachers.

Secondly, I replaced a dean who had been encouraged to leave for a variety of reasons, partly because she was caught up in a complex situation, but also because faculty had refused to continue its work in preparation for a forthcoming review by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). I entered a situation where many faculty believed they had been unfairly treated and abused and where morale was considered low in some departments. This situation was further complicated by a bitter contract dispute between the unionized faculty and the state of Connecticut. The union president in 1991 and the immediate past president both held their academic ranks in the school of education.

Thirdly, in 1991 CCSU had a relatively new president who had brought a new sense of purpose to the university and new expectations for faculty. A classical Greek scholar, he believed firmly that all faculty should have a scholarly agenda and that their inquiry should become part of the "dialogue in their discipline." This translated into new demands on faculty to publish and to present at scholarly conferences. Under his presidency, scholarship and creative activity became an important criterion for promotion and tenure, which had only been lightly considered by previous administrations. This stance by the president, which was one I supported, had met with considerable opposition by some faculty members. However, it bolstered my own efforts to further involve faculty in scholarly and networking pursuits.

Fourth, the new academic vice president was the former dean of the graduate school and had chaired the search committee that selected me. It was a fortunate move for me and the school of education, because she had her doctorate in education, and had been a faculty member and department chair at a large university before coming to Connecticut. She held

her academic appointment in our school's department of educational leadership. More importantly, she was committed to helping the university develop a unique metropolitan mission, and she solidly supported programs in the human services and education. She was an advocate (some say "lightning rod") for making the faculty and student body reflect the racial diversity in the greater Hartford metropolitan region. Our subsequent plans to initiate programs in urban teacher education received her early and continued personal support, as did our efforts to develop a network of professional developments schools.

Finally, the year before I came to CCSU, most of New England experienced a severe recession which cut funds for state and local agencies. Higher education did not escape, and shortfalls and budget reductions became a way of life. For lack of a budget, the university closed its doors for two days during my first week. This situation, however, had a positive side effect. To save money, the state initiated a series of incentives to encourage early retirements. So we found ourselves with a once-in-a-life time opportunity to renew the university and the school by hiring a large number of recently prepared and energetic faculty who had significantly different perspectives from the faculty who had been at the university in earlier eras. Part of my job, however, became one of encouraging cooperation among newer and veteran elements. Loss of state funds also served as a strong incentive for me and the faculty to seek outside resources to support our work, which we did with some success.

Noting My Background & Values

I accepted the position at CCSU for a combination of personal and professional reasons. On the personal side, my late wife was from New England and saw Connecticut as one of several desirable places to live and raise a family. On a professional side, I had grown weary of large, research-focused universities where most faculty did not share my interest in teacher education and where collegiality was difficult to find. I believed (and still do) that a university like CCSU, with a rich history and strong traditions in preparing teachers, could be a fertile place to apply my interests and energies. I also believed that modest-sized institutions (10,000 to 15,000 students) hold a greater potential for developing collegiality and learning communities than do large universities with student bodies in the 25,000 to 60,000 range.

Although CCSU was my first deanship, I didn't feel like a new dean. I had held difficult and complex administrative positions in public education and higher education for over two decades, including chairing

a department at the University of Maryland that was larger than CCSU's School of Education. I came to the role with definite ideas about what I thought a school of education should be doing and some pretty clear strategies for getting things to change. Dating back to my Teacher Corps days in the 1970s, I had held firm to a belief that schools of education should have central to their mission the task of preparing teachers, and that they should make special efforts to recruit and prepare individuals who would work in urban schools. Many universities, even those with rich traditions in preparing teachers, had often abandoned this mission in the post-World War II era, as more economically and professionally rewarding pursuits came along. This trend had been thoroughly documented by Judge (1982), Holmes (1986), Clifford, & Guthrie, (1988), and Goodlad (1992). For a long time, I also had held strong beliefs about the importance of research and the knowledge bases on teaching and learning and how this knowledge should serve as the core of professional preparation curricula.

Finally, deep in my value system had been a set of beliefs about the relationship between schools of education and K-12 schools. There are two important settings for learning to teach: the college laboratory and the school classroom. It follows that school reform must be tied to the reform of teacher education and that reform of teacher education is impossible without reform in schools. Reform is definitely a necessary, though perilous, journey K-12 teachers and higher education faculty must make together.

Accomplishing Strategies for Change

Several significant changes have occurred at CCSU. One, the faculty designed and gained approval for a revised teacher education program beyond the traditional limits for preparation, built on a set of constructivist principles and including programmatic alternatives for teacher candidates and a strong strand to prepare teachers for urban schools. Two, a network of professional development schools (PDSes) was established to help K-12 schools enhance learning opportunities for students and provide strong clinical sites for CCSU teacher candidates. Finally, a resource base was established to finance innovations in teacher education and professional development school activities. The processes leading up to these changes are organized below into two major sections: (1) the activities associated with setting the stages and developing the capacity to change, and (2) those connected to the changes themselves.

Developing Capacity by Creating New Organizational Structures and Processes

I came to the deanship with a fully developed theory about the processes of change in schools and higher education organizations. A significant portion of my doctoral training had been under the direction of Richard Schmuck and Philip Runkel at the University of Oregon. As one of their research assistants in the early 1970s, I contributed to the study of organization development (OD), a strategy to support organizational improvement and renewal. Also, our particular approach to OD (Arends & Arends, 1977; Schmuck & Runkel, 1994; Schmuck, Runkel, Arends & Arends, 1977) rested on open systems theory. We viewed organizations, such as schools, as embedded in complex, ever-changing environments necessitating continuous change and renewal if they were to adapt and survive. Further, when change occurs, it happens in a complex human system that requires perceptual shifts on the part of individuals as they strive to make meaning out of new realities, as well as change in the norms and culture of the organization required to support particular innovations.

"Readiness" is an important principle in the organizational change literature, particularly at the onset of a change effort (Fullan, 1991; Runkel, 1974; Runkel, Wyant, & Bell, 1975). Faculty (at least a sizable portion of them) must be ready to commit themselves to work toward particular improvements, supported by the encouragement of key leaders such as deans and provosts. Willingness, support, and good intentions, however, are not the only ingredients of readiness. Certain organizational norms, structures, and processes must also be present. Norms must be present to support group tasks and interdependent actions. Structures must be present so faculty have time to engage in joint problem-solving and make clear decisions. If these structures and processes do not exist, the first step is to build organizational capacity for change. [1]

[1] This discussion is a reconstruction of events as I experienced and remember them. The words may read like things progressed from one well-planned stage to another and in a linear and orderly fashion. That was not the case. There were many false starts, most of which I have now forgotten, and many instances where strategies did not become clear until action had been taken. I also was not the only actor in the process; many others played key roles and carried out important leadership activities.

Establishing Forums for Dialogue

Improvement and renewal, from an organizational development perspective, requires interdependent behavior, as well as open communication and dialogue among organizational members. It also requires forums where shared problem-solving and decision-making can occur. It is through continuous dialogue and shared problem-solving that we come to share the realities of each other's worlds and come to understand the conceptual maps of each other's minds. Without shared understanding, mutual plans supporting improvement and renewal stall.

Although universities pride themselves as forums for reasoned discourse, in reality few formal or informal settings exist that allow meaningful discourse and problem-solving in day-to-day work. Procedures exist for the approval of particular courses, but not whole programs. Seminars and colloquia are characterized by intellectual debate, but seldom do participants deal with matters pertaining to teaching or curriculum; forums for governance are most often, in my experience, characterized by petty politics and voting on issues that are often on the fringe of the university's central mission.

During the first month of my deanship, I started what became known as "dean's seminars." Held on an irregular basis but at least once a month, I invited faculty to discuss a variety of topics with nationally or locally prominent educators. Seminars were held in my office, and I provided a light lunch for the first 18 to 20 faculty members who accepted the invitation. The agenda for these seminars was simple. The guest gave a 5- to 10-minute introduction to his or her work, then the faculty discussed what the work meant to them and their work at CCSU. From the beginning, seminars were well attended, and by spring 1992, faculty were inviting individuals from their own personal and professional networks as seminar leaders, such as members of Glickman's School Renewal Network and Goodlad's Teacher Education Network.

The following year, the department of teacher education started its own forum, "Lunch and Learn." This monthly event was coordinated by a relatively new assistant professor and became a major forum for faculty to highlight their own research, learn about their colleagues' views on important K-16 issues, and learn to talk about their work with one another. Whenever possible, I attended "Lunch and Learn" sessions because they stimulated my own thinking, gave me a place to air my views, and let faculty see that I valued any forum that encouraged common discourse.

There is nothing magical or heroic about this kind of leadership behavior nor does it consume an incredible amount of resources. Most

individuals who led "dean's seminars" did so *pro bona*; others agreed to participate with modest assistance toward their travel expenses.

Establishing Structures for Decision-making

If faculty are to take collective responsibility for leadership and organizational change, structures must exist where issues can be debated and decisions made in clear and acceptable ways. These structures can take many forms, and decisions can be made in a variety of ways—turning it over to the dean, voting, or consensus. The crucial point is that decision-making structures and processes must leave participants with an understanding of their decisions, a feeling that their views have been heard, and a commitment that they will not sabotage a decision as it is implemented, even if they disagree with it.

At CCSU, I inherited a governance situation that had produced a great deal of disenchantment. For years, dating back perhaps to the 1960s (no one was sure), a body called the Teacher Education Assembly (TEA) consisted of all university faculty who had anything to do with teacher education. It met twice a semester under the direction of the dean of the school of education. Veteran faculty reported that the TEA was not a real decision-making forum, but rather was a place for the dean to make announcements and explain various administrative policies to faculty. My predecessor knew this structure would not meet the NCATE governance standard, so she created a more representative body called Council on Professional Education (COPE). This body, like the TEA, included faculty from education and the arts and sciences who were involved with programs in education. COPE was perceived as a forum controlled by the dean; its exact decision-making authority was unclear to faculty. Further, COPE was opposed by some faculty who believed it duplicated university-wide decision-making processes.

I never convened COPE. Instead, I held several meetings with interested faculty explaining that a strong decision-making body was needed for our own use and for meeting the NCATE standard if we chose to seek national accreditation in the future. At these meetings, I described my belief that collective responsibility for leadership could not be realized without clearly defined processes and procedures. Subsequently, a task force was appointed to review COPE and recommend a replacement that would meet NCATE standards and be embraced by faculty.

By spring semester 1992, a new governance structure (NEW)[2] with several important features was proposed. NEW prescribed that all faculty from the school of education and representatives from arts and sciences

and each school that sponsored a teacher education program would meet monthly to consider and approve all policies pertaining to professional preparation. The main work (curriculum approval, program evaluation, and student appeals) would be handled by committees. The NEW Curriculum Committee was the largest of the three committees and had precise representation from education and the arts and sciences. All curriculum changes had to be approved by the NEW Curriculum Committee prior to my consideration and prior to sending them to the university's curriculum committees. A critical feature was that NEW and NEW Curriculum would be convened, not by the dean, but by a faculty president. NEW's president was given a reduced teaching load in exchange for assuming responsibility for coordinating the work of the faculty and its major committees. The faculty and I were extremely fortunate that one of the school's most distinguished faculty members was elected as faculty president, a post he holds to this day.

Setting up Long-range Planning Structures

I cut my administrative teeth in the early 1980s when universities were first experiencing budget difficulties and downsizing. Strategic planning became the vogue, and George Keller, one of its primary conceptualizers, was a colleague of mine at the University of Maryland. From the beginning, I had reservations about the strategic planning process, used by university administrators all too often to co-opt faculty into cutting low-status programs. Nonetheless, I have always believed in the benefits of long-range planning and goal-setting for both individuals and organizations.

When I came to CCSU, the university was writing its first strategic plan. However, no goals had been forwarded from the school of education to be included in the university's plan because the school did not have a long-range planning process. I went to the Council of Chairs, an effective body of all the school's department chairs who coordinated schoolwide activities and advised the dean. I recommended to the council that we establish a long-range planning process and appoint a committee with representatives from each department and program. Perhaps only to humor the new dean, they agreed with my recommendations.

[2] The letters NEW do not stand for anything. They simply mean the "new governance structure." Efforts to name it something else were resisted and the word NEW seemed to stick. One wit, however, suggested that NEW stands for "Nothing Ever Works."

This committee, still in existence, was remarkably productive. It produced a highly acclaimed planning document with strategic goals directed toward redesigning teacher education, creating professional development schools, making the faculty more influential in state and national policy matters, and creating a better learning environment in the school for both faculty and students. The *Long-Range Plan* (1992) was presented and approved by faculty in fall 1992, one of NEW's first actions.

The Long-range Planning Committee has been invaluable to the faculty. It helped me set priorities for my own activities and those of my associate deans and staff, served as a basis for continued dialogue among the faculty, and conveyed to the vice president and others in the university community about the direction of the school under my leadership.

Changing Recruitment and Selection Procedures

I described in a previous section how the state's early retirement incentives provided a unique opportunity to recruit new faculty. When I became dean, I negotiated with the university's administration for the authority to fill all open faculty lines during the first 3 years of my deanship. To take full advantage of this opportunity, however, would require some new procedures for recruiting and selecting faculty. Past practices in the school consisted of faculty lines being returned automatically to the department where a vacancy occurred and of allowing departments a great deal of autonomy in their search and selection procedures. I thought that these procedures were not working very well. Two out of four searches conducted during the 1990-91 academic year were still in progress when I arrived in July 1991. Several of the recent hires had been from local universities, the University of Connecticut or the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. Although some excellent faculty had been obtained from these institutions, I wanted the school to recruit more broadly and nationally.

I began immediate discussions with the Council of Chairs on policies governing recruitment and selection of new faculty. These discussions resulted in a two-page policy statement outlining a new set of procedures for all school of education searches. Key features included:

- Departments would submit requests to fill vacancies to me for my approval after consultation with the vice president;
- All search decisions would be made in October so a schoolwide (rather than departmental) advertisement could be placed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in a timely fashion;

- All search committees would have to meet with my approval, and committees were required to have minority representatives and a representative from another department; and
- All candidates brought to campus for interviews would be required to make a schoolwide presentation.

I also made it clear that departmental selection recommendations had to be approved by me, the vice president, and the president.

The department chairs agreed, but the new policies were not as readily accepted by all faculty. Some faculty members argued that the schoolwide policies interfered with their departmental bylaws and the internal workings of their personnel committees. Consequently, I spent most of a month visiting various departments to explain the new policy and the reasoning behind it. I emphasized the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to hire a large number of new faculty from a rich national pool and to involve everyone in the school. I explained that the searches of the previous year had failed because of a late start and an unaggressive recruitment policy.

In November, I moved ahead with the first *Chronicle* announcement, even though I knew that there was considerable unrest, particularly in two departments. Part of the unrest was due to my decisions over the allocation of faculty lines. The main issue was the dean's "interference" in internal departmental matters. To test my resolve, one department presented to me a search committee without an outside representative and chaired by a faculty member who had been denied tenure. I said that the situation was unacceptable, and that I would terminate the search if they persisted in their decision. The department changed its mind, but a defamation of character lawsuit is still pending from the deposed committee chair. However, the contention over these policies receded after the first year, primarily, I think, because we acquired some exceptionally strong faculty and part of our success (or luck) could be attributed to the active schoolwide recruitment efforts.

Securing Resources to Buy Faculty Time

I knew from many years of working and consulting with faculty in K-12 schools and in higher education that joint planning and problem-solving cannot occur, nor can learning communities be developed, unless faculty have time to meet and to make their plans. The importance of planning time is well documented in the literature on school change. The complexity of providing it, however, is complicated in instances where K-12 teachers or higher education faculty have detailed working agree-

ments under union contracts, a situation we had at CCSU. I addressed this challenge using the few means I had at my disposal.

First, I negotiated with the vice president to allow me to keep control of some of the school's salary savings that accrued when vacancies existed or when faculty took leaves or sabbaticals. The vice president agreed to my proposal with the understanding that the monies would be used primarily to support the work of faculty and K-12 teachers while redesigning the university's teacher education programs and developing a network of professional development schools. These resources supported our change efforts during the first 2 years of my deanship and, although they were subsequently overshadowed by external R & D resources, without them it would not have been possible for the faculty or me to achieve very much.

Second, with the help of my associate dean, we blocked the schedule so no classes were taught in the school on Thursdays between 11:30 am and 1:30 pm. This would allow time for departmental and cross-departmental meetings, faculty governance, and, ultimately, meetings for the task forces charged with redesigning our teacher education programs.

Establishing a Dean's Office to Support Change

A final internal structure I strived to change was my own office. The previous dean did not have good relationships with faculty and therefore her office (so it was reported) was not perceived as a very helpful place. I took steps to make it known that the dean's office stood ready to support faculty and would do what we could to make things work better. I was fortunate because my new associate dean, assistant dean, and administrative assistant were strong individuals with extensive experience at other institutions. They were able and willing to work with faculty and consider changes that would enhance our overall effectiveness. Also, I started to use a small portion of my own travel budget to support faculty travel to events or locations that could extend our vision about the preparation of school personnel or about working with schools. The amount of monies for this type of support was minimal, but I thought it was important for faculty to know that I would help out as best I could.

Working on Program Improvement Initiatives

During my interview for the CCSU deanship, I had made it clear to the faculty and the university administration that I held some pretty definite views about professional preparation programs. I emphasized the importance of having programs that would provide teacher candidates

with a strong general education, a thorough grounding in the knowledge bases associated with teaching and learning, and relevant experiences working with teachers in K-12 schools. I said that the typical 4-year bachelor's degree program was insufficient and that extended or graduate-level programs would be required. I also pointed to my University of Maryland experiences where we had experimented with alternative teacher education programs for individuals who already had bachelor's degrees. My conclusion from all of these experiences, however, was that there was no one best way for preparing teachers—there were many.

As I began my deanship, I continued to talk about these ideas in many forums, and emphasized that I would support programmatic changes. My ideas turned out to be similar to those of several faculty members in the school, and I found several initiatives which could serve as a basis for larger and more comprehensive redesigns. For instance, some faculty were experimenting with the nature of the early field experiences, beginning to teach portions of their methods classes in K-12 classrooms, or striving to integrate content across various courses in regular and special education through team teaching. Initial contacts had been made with several local schools to form partnerships. It appeared that the best thing I could do was to identify and support those experimental efforts which had potential.

However, I did not encourage any formal or sustained action on program redesign during the first 2 years of my deanship. Although the faculty had decided to terminate their efforts to gain national accreditation, we were nonetheless faced with a state review governed by a process and a set of accreditation standards very similar to NCATE's and every bit as intimidating. The state's previous review had been very critical of several programs and had placed one on probation. I deemed it vital to put my energy, and that of my staff, into preparing for the state review rather than initiate program change prematurely.

I also knew from my previous experiences that efforts at sustained program change, particularly with new kinds of arrangements, such as professional development schools, required clear governance procedures, long-range planning, and available resources. Building these capacities in support of change would take time. In 1991, resources to support new programs simply did not exist. The university's budget was slashed, the school's small foundation account had been eliminated by the previous dean, and the school had less than $50,000 in outside grants and contracts. During this period, it seemed best for me to support and work with the several faculty initiatives underway rather than risk interrupting their work for a too-ambitious agenda.

In fall 1992, the new faculty governance structure (NEW) was approved and the school's first long-range plan received faculty approval. A team from the state department of education visited CCSU in April 1993 and gave us a very positive review. All standards were met without a single weakness—something that had never happened before in Connecticut. The review team also lauded faculty, including their preparation for the review, the field experiences they were providing for students, their initial efforts at creating school partnerships, and their long-range plan.

Working on Program Redesign

At NEW's April 1993 meeting, I commended faculty formally (we had an earlier champagne celebration) for the success with the state review, and I announced my hope that we would now move into a formal process of considering major redesign of our professional preparation programs and seeking NCATE accreditation. I argued that although our programs had just been recognized for their high quality, there was still considerable room for improvement and that internal reform was best accomplished in a climate free from external criticism. I also argued that first-rate schools of education were willing to submit their programs for judgment by national standards.

After a spirited debate, the faculty voted by an overwhelming margin to seek NCATE accreditation, and we started to plan for the redesign of teacher education which would be launched by a 2-day summer retreat. All faculty involved in education preparation programs in the school of education, the arts and sciences, and other schools were invited to attend.

Several university administrators, including the academic vice president, and nearly 60 faculty members participated in the 2-day retreat held in May 1993. Kenneth R. Howey (Ohio State University) served as seminar presenter and facilitator. Howey described how case studies done by Nancy Zimpher and himself (Howey and Zimpher, 1989) spoke to the key features of effective teacher education programs. The retreat also highlighted several CCSU faculty members who were experimenting with various aspects of their programs. The faculty left the retreat with a greater awareness of our programs' shortcomings and appeared committed to two features of teacher education—the importance of building teacher education programs around overall themes and resting the programs squarely on the knowledge bases of teaching and learning.

The retreat's discussions were summarized and distributed to faculty when they returned in fall 1993. With the assistance of the faculty president and several faculty leaders in the redesign, I appointed a

knowledge base task force and a structures/processes task force. Each task force had a nice mix of CCSU veterans and newer faculty and a healthy cross-section of faculty from arts, sciences, business, and technology. The knowledge base group was charged with identifying principles that would define what beginning teachers should know and be able to do. The structures/processes group would study features of successful teacher education programs such as the use of themes, cohorts, and professional development schools. Although it was recognized that the work of the two groups would overlap, both groups were deemed necessary so more faculty could be involved.

This was a time when I took a deep breath and counted my blessings. Since April, I had been very nervous and tense. With my deanship and the school's future at a critical crossroads, I knew that any number of actions could have turned everything in a different direction. A negative review by the state's program review would have forced us into fixing existing programs rather than inventing new ones; a negative vote on NCATE would set us back; faculty unwillingness to attend the retreat or a bad retreat experience would have been serious blows to program redesign. Fortunately, none of these things occurred, and in fall 1993 we were making plans that would influence the school for years to come.

Both of the redesign task forces met regularly throughout the 1993-94 academic year. I had hoped that new program could be designed and ready for formal faculty review by the end of the year. A second retreat held in May 1994, however, showed me the error of my ways and impressed on me the length of time required for change. A partial knowledge base document had been produced and several themes had been identified. Good ideas abounded, but little agreement existed once faculty began to specify particular courses or field experiences.

Nonetheless, faculty appeared to be energized by the debates and discussions, and recommended that the two task forces be merged into one Program Redesign Committee. I asked the faculty president and the new chair of the department of teacher education to serve as cochairs of the newly formed committee.

The Program Redesign Committee met regularly throughout the 1994-95 academic year. By this time, our involvement in UNITE was beginning to affect the committee's work. Faculty returned from UNITE meetings with new ideas and placed new emphasis on our urban strand for teacher education. At a third summer retreat, held in May 1995, faculty were presented with proposals from the Program Redesign Committee. After extended discussion, faculty tentatively agreed on several features of the redesign:

- Teacher education at CCSU would be embodied in the idea of "Developing Leaders for Learning Communities." Several subthemes supported this idea.

- The 10 principles, which had been written into the NCATE standards and were guiding Connecticut's certification process, would serve as a framework for the program's knowledge bases, along with an 11th principle on leadership added by CCSU faculty.

- A common set of courses would serve as the core for all teacher education programs. The core would be the major vehicle for transmitting the knowledge bases to teacher candidates in the programs.

- The use of cohort groups connected to particular professional development schools was embraced.

- Extending the preparation of teachers into a fifth year with some credits counting toward a master's degree was agreed upon in principle.

A small group of faculty constituted a Redesign Writing Team, who would work over the summer on a full proposal that could be submitted to NEW and the larger university for formal program review and approval in fall 1995.

The document was submitted to faculty for final discussion prior to gaining formal approval from NEW and the university curriculum committees—the most conflict-ridden time in the whole redesign process. Now that particular courses and concrete experiences were proposed, several faculties started to question the overall plan. For instance, one group argued for more multicultural education; another for more mathematics; still others wanted to pull their students out of full participation in the common core. There was much contention over who bore primary responsibility for the new middle school program. I was anxious to keep things moving forward. I planned to take a leave of absence in winter 1996 and wanted to have the program approved prior to my departure. More importantly, however, I believed it was time to bring closure to this aspect of our work. Faculty involvement in planning can only be sustained for a short time, and I believed we had reached the limit.

In the early stages of planning, I had been quite active in the debate, believing it was important for my ideas to be known and for others to know what I valued. But in this final stage, I tried to remain neutral in regard to differences that now existed among faculties and to the negotiations that were going on. Strong faculty leadership for the redesign now

existed and was more than capable of defending their plan. I thought that the dean's intrusion at this point had the possibility of only complicating matters. I did, however, continue to express my overall support for the plan and encourage everyone to move forward on those aspects of the plan where consensus did exist. That is what happened.

Establishing Professional Development Schools

In reality, the redesign of teacher education and the evolution of the professional development school network were intertwined. However, each had a separate life of its own and was influenced by an independent stream of events.

Early in my academic career, I became the director of a Teacher Corps Project. In that role I became convinced of the importance of school-university partnerships for preparing teachers. Also, while I was at the University of Maryland, I had an opportunity to be involved with that institution's award-winning teacher education centers, a highly sophisticated partnership arrangement which had existed since the 1960s. I made my support for school-university partnerships clearly known while interviewing for the CCSU deanship, so faculty and administration knew I had that on my agenda. Fortunately, my goals matched those of some of the faculty and definitely of the university's administration.

CCSU faculty were aware of the professional development school movement. In the spring semester, prior to my arrival, four assistant professors had written to several local superintendents inquiring about school-university partnerships. This initiative received favorable responses from three superintendents, and I was invited by faculty in fall 1991 to attend several initial meetings to discuss partnership arrangements. These discussions resulted in some informal agreements, and by the end of the 1991-92 academic year, we were working in three schools. The road to full partnership with these schools was a rocky one and provided valuable lessons about the importance of keeping all stakeholders sufficiently informed, possessing clear agreements on the K-12 schools' contributions to the partnerships, and planning ways to sustain partnerships when key individuals such as principals leave. These three schools, however, comprised the beginning of our current professional development school network, and each remains a partner to this day.

The university administration warmed quickly to the idea of professional development schools. PDSes held the potential to provide a positive example of how the university could serve as a major intellectual resource to the metropolitan area and how it could help the region move

out of its economic difficulties. How better to illustrate this support than showing faculty working in schools, particularly schools that had a large number of minority and at-risk students?

During the 1992-93 academic year, I took an active role in sustaining the three partnerships, began discussions for additional partnerships, and started problem-solving with faculty about how professional development school work might be translated into the unionized workload formula. Also, I began seeking outside resources to support our partnerships. We were able to maintain our three partnerships during that academic year and faculty members, one in her first year, started working in an area high school and a middle school. Relationships with all the partners during this period of time, however, remained quite informal and extremely fragile. Without resources, I did not think we could do much more.

With program redesign now in full swing, it became clear that major changes would be required in our programs' clinical components. The traditional model of placing a single student teacher with a single cooperating teacher was insufficient, regardless of how well-trained these teachers were or how well coordinated their placements and supervision were. Faculty and others started to look to our emerging network of professional development schools as the answer.

• The resource situation improved between fall 1993 and fall 1994. Our acceptance into the UNITE network in fall 1993 provided resources and a forum to take several major steps on professional development schools. Monies now existed to hold meetings and pay teachers for assisting with our planning efforts. It also enabled us to provide training for professional development school teachers in a state-required cooperating teacher training program. With additional resources, I also began releasing faculty from a portion of their teaching load to coordinate PDS activities. Involvement in a national network of SCDEs interested in the clinical aspects of urban teacher education granted new status and weight to all of these local efforts.

Most importantly, I used some of the UNITE resources to hire a person to work one day a week with the express objective of finding external resources to support professional development schools, teaching laboratories, and other activities associated with urban teacher education. In June 1994, we submitted a proposal to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) requesting monies from the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) to establish a professional development school network, Partners for Learning in Urban Schools (PLUS). Suddenly we had $1.4 million spread over three years to support urban

teacher education and professional development schools—the largest grant the university had ever received.

The following year we submitted a second proposal to OERI under its Eisenhower Program. Again, we were successful in acquiring over $1 million to extend our local PDS network and help other Connecticut institutions of higher education to explore the PDS concept. The FIE and Eisenhower resources made it possible for me to release faculty members to work in our professional development schools, pay teachers in the schools to coordinate clinical activities, and expand the size of the network from 3 to 11 schools. These grants also provided monies to train teachers and faculty in the important aspects of PDSes.

In the beginning, I served as project director of the PLUS Project and, as such, was actively involved with all PLUS activities. However, as soon as the project was secure, I began to remove myself from the day-to-day involvement with the professional development schools and eventually, I relinquished my role as director. A faculty member in the department of educational leadership took over the director's position of PLUS and significantly strengthened the research component of the project. The chair of the department of teacher education assumed full responsibility for the professional development school network. Under her leadership, and with the new external resources, the network started to flourish. She began holding monthly meetings with the principals, the teacher-coordinators, and the university facilitators. Together they developed a mission statement and a set of goals for the network. They also began to delineate roles and expectations for the university faculty member assigned to the school and for the teacher who served as site coordinator.

Several new schools have expressed a desire to become part of the network. The work at each school is coordinated by a CCSU faculty member and a teacher in the school. The faculty member is provided release from teaching to carry out this responsibility; teachers are paid a stipend for their work. I worry a lot, however, about the network's future. Unlike the redesign of curriculum where new courses replace old ones, professional development schools introduce new structures and, like all new structures or processes in human settings, remain fragile for a long time and cannot be sustained without resources—primarily resources to pay for faculty and teacher time. Only the future will tell us whether or not sufficient resources were captured at CCSU.

Connecting Faculty with State and National Forums

The last piece of my story focuses on the theme of developing the human side of the organization.

In most schools of education today, it is important to help faculty see themselves in different ways. Being a published expert is no longer sufficient, nor is winning the annual award for "excellence in teaching." We must help faculty see themselves as scholar practitioners—scholars in the sense that they have a major responsibility for studying what they do; practitioners in that they can teach and practice along side their K-12 colleagues. Doing faculty development in higher education is difficult and complex. Unlike their K-12 counterparts, higher education faculty resist attending workshops or taking classes. Instead, they prefer more individualized approaches. I have found that connecting faculty with other faculty, particularly those involved with national and state scholarly societies and policy-making forums, is one way to develop the human resources in a school of education. This is a crucial role to play for deans who want to facilitate change; it was particularly important at CCSU.

When I arrived at CCSU in 1991, state mandates had contributed to a climate of apathy among education faculty. Connecticut was one of the first states to pass school and teacher reform legislation with its 1986 Education Enhancement Act. This legislation, and subsequent regulations from the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), made Connecticut teachers the highest paid in the country and required the evaluation of student teachers and beginning teachers on a set of specified competencies, the Connecticut Teaching Competencies (CTC). CSDE policy also had specified that teacher education programs would be judged on the performance of graduates on CTC assessments and required that student teachers be placed only in classrooms where cooperating teachers had received state-sponsored training. All of these reforms had been mandated with little or no involvement from the higher education community, including the CCSU faculty. Individuals at institutions may have been consulted, but not in any official way. The Connecticut Association of Colleges for Teacher Education believed its advice had been ignored, and by 1991, the teacher education community in Connecticut was engaged in open warfare with the CSDE.

Few CCSU faculty were connected in any meaningful way to national scholarly organizations. In 1991, no education faculty presented at AERA, and only two attended the annual meeting. No federal grants or contracts had been acquired except for a small one that facilitated faculty exchanges between CCSU and sister colleges in the Bahamas and Jamaica.

I was not alone in wanting faculty development and larger state and national involvement. In fact, the Long-range Planning Committee wrote that we "should develop structures and processes within the school for the purpose of expanding faculty influence and leadership over policy development..." This was a goal that I could help faculty achieve.

I had a modest national network developed over the many years of working with teacher centers, Teacher Corps, and a variety of research and policies committees in AERA, the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), and AACTE. I had more than a working knowledge of the U.S. Department of Education as a result of living in the Washington, DC, area for a decade and receiving many federal grants. Throughout my career, I had sought ways to connect to the teaching profession by building relationships with state departments of education, local staff development councils, and national professional associations such as the National Education Association (NEA). I had a good reputation with these groups upon which I could draw.

I spent considerable time during my first 2 years at CCSU building local networks and sustaining national ones. I also made use of every opportunity to highlight the importance of faculty involvement with state and national scholarly and policy-making bodies. Those who involved in this type of work know it means making a lot of phone calls, attending many meetings, and eating lots of chicken dinners.

Within a year, I found myself on several local and regional boards and committees and efforts soon began to pay off. Individuals in the CSDE started to consult with us about teacher education issues and sought my nomination for statewide committees or task forces. This gave me and the faculty early information about the status of various policy initiatives, and allowed faculty to be appointed to committees. My presidency of CACUTE and subsequent invitation to chair a blue-ribbon committee on new accreditation standards for teacher education further enhanced the opportunities for CCSU to become more involved. A group of faculty was awarded a substantial contract from the CSDE to write a monograph on what elementary teachers needed to know and be able to do, and how they should be prepared.

Today, faculty have nearly $1 million annually in R & D monies. Large contingencies attend and present at national meetings such as AERA and AACTE, and several of the newer faculty members are beginning to have their voices heard in state and regional policy-making circles.

Setting Key Principles of Deaning for Change

So what have I learned about deaning, particularly that aspect of the role aimed at improvement and change? There are many lenses for viewing organizations and organizational change, but concepts from open systems theory acquired over two decades ago still translate into several solid, important principles.

Change occurs in complex human systems, and we have to start our efforts where these systems are.

When I became dean, I inherited an institution and a school of education with a proud heritage, but with some very serious economic and structural problems. It would have been senseless to initiate major reform without first helping faculty define their goals and then build internal capacity through new structures and processes that would accomplish these goals. This proposition is self-evident to me, yet I often see efforts all around me that ignore it. There are always some parts of the system ready to change while others are not.

Successful changes occurs when we work with the most promising parts of a system and avoid "working up hill."

It did not take long at CCSU to identify faculty and units associated with reform initiatives. Similarly, it did not take long to spot those satisfied with the status quo and those pining for the "golden era" of earlier years. I do not believe that administrators in higher education get very far if they choose to fight the resisters. Our institutions and ourselves are much better served when we work with faculty and others who want improvement, when we support projects that hold promise for success. I was fortunate at CCSU to find faculty who wanted to make connections to the public schools, found their existing programs inadequate, and were willing to assume shared leadership for reform.

Successful change requires good ideas.

K-12 and higher education settings are littered with failed innovations of the past half century. The new curricula of the 1960s (developed mainly by academics), competency-based teacher education, career education, and direct instruction are only a few that most deans have experienced in their careers. Many of these innovations failed because they were simply bad and faddish ideas to begin with. Others failed because those responsible (deans, superintendents, principals) did not understand them. I do not believe that the practice of choosing leaders (a

dean, for example) because of their scholarship or their charisma works. Change in the right direction requires that deans know about the history, practices, curriculum, and processes associated with preparing school personnel.

Most of the recent literature stresses the importance of a clear vision for leader effectiveness. Too often a vision either becomes something inscribed on stone tablets or known only to the heroic leader. The best a dean can do is to have a few good ideas and articulate them to faculty, be clear on what points are most valued, and encourage faculty to take collective responsibility for shaping a shared vision.

Successful change requires good ideas about the processes of change.

Twenty-five years of scholarship has shown how change happens and how change processes must be directed simultaneously toward the individual and toward the organization. We must help individuals conceive and find their own meaning in new programs or new structures, but it takes time. Many leaders in higher education and policymakers do not understand this proposition, thinking that their deluge of new policies and edicts will be embraced, then are astonished when nothing happens. While individuals must change to establish new methods, organizational norms, routines, and culture must also change, as when CCSU began its effort to create PDSes.

Faculty must become knowledgeable and comfortable in working in schools in new and different ways. This will not happen, however, unless the reward and workload structures are changed to support working in schools. Deans have a critical role to play in supporting individuals as they try to learn new ways of doing things. They also must help modify organizational norms and structures that impede change.

Faculty will exercise self-direction toward goals to which they are committed and will resist goals that are externally imposed.

This principle has been supported by management theory and research for over 50 years (Argyris, 1957; Hertzberg, 1976; McGregor, 1967; Wheatley, 1992), and yet it is largely ignored. Over the past two decades, much of the reform in K-12 and higher education has been externally imposed, sometimes by agencies; sometimes by superintendents or deans. This type of change simply does not work. If we want to promote reform as deans, we must challenge the traditional assumptions about external motivation and recognize that most faculty are self-motivated to enhance their own status and experience a sense of accomplishment.

This means that deans should spend much considerable time and energy in building structures and processes that will support both faculty initiatives and their own capacity for taking action directed toward change.

Successful change, thus, requires resources.

Many efforts at reform fail because sufficient resources do not exist to support them. The two major reforms in teacher education over the past 20 years have been to extend the length of programs and create a new type of clinical site, the professional development school. Both of these innovations require significant additional resources. Programs in education, however, tend to be underfunded. Few extra resources exist to experiment with or foster bold initiatives. It is folly to move forward with major change efforts until some type of realistic resource base has been secured to support them.

Change must be loaded for direct action and success.

Michael Fullan (1993) is right in his assertion that our actions often precede our goals—his ready-fire-aim principle. Although I believe leaders should have clearly stated goals and help faculty develop a sense of vision and mission, it is equally important for leaders to be poised to take action and support others who act. Small steps can lead to larger ones; pilot programs can test the feasibility of new processes and programs. Action that captures *the moment* can lead to success as well as build new knowledge and skills. All of this provides leaders and their faculties with the confidence to move ahead with larger actions and efforts. It also allows them to demonstrate to external agencies that they can get things done, a critical condition for capturing resources.

Change is a process that takes time.

I have probably said these words hundreds of times in my career; however, my actions have not always been consistent with my words. Often I have been impatient and pushed my own agenda forward more quickly than others wanted. The fact that it took almost 5 years to design and approve a new teacher education program at CCSU, even under fairly favorable circumstances, illustrates the time required to do this kind of work. It will take another 5 years to fully implement the program and another 5 to revise it. We must consider major changes in terms of decades rather than years—a difficult situation for many of us, although I think I am better at it than I used to be.

References

Arends, R. I. & Arends, J. H. (1977). *Systems change strategies in educational settings.* New York: Human Science Press.

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization.* New York: Harper & Row.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. P. (1988). *Ed school.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fowler, H. E. (1949). *A century of teacher education in Connecticut.* New Britain, CT: Teachers College of Connecticut at New Britain.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform.* Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Goodlad, J. I.(1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hertzberg, F. (1976). *The managerial choice.* Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Howey, K. & Zimpher N. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Judge, H. (1982). *American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad.* New York: Ford Foundation.

McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager.* New York: McGraw Hill.

The Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Schmuck, R.A. & Runkel, P.J. (1994). *The handbook of organization development in schools and colleges.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Schmuck, R.A., Runkel, P.J., Arends, J.H. & Arends, R.I. (1977). *The second handbook of organization development in schools.* Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Runkel, P.J. (1974). *Annotated bibliography of change in schools.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Runkel, P. J., Wyant, S. H. & Bell, W. E. (1975). *Organizational specialists in a school district: four years of innovation.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Wheatley, M.J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

DEANS OF EDUCATION: Only the Reform-Minded Need Apply

Dennis Thiessen

What can be learned about deaning from the authors who have contributed to this volume? It is tempting to collect, combine, and compare the many insights, bits of advice, and snapshots into practice these deans have offered. Such a composite would no doubt provide a valuable glimpse into the lives of an especially talented group of leaders and a compelling model for those new to the job to follow. Yet what they do is more than the sum of timely and adept acts of leadership. They exemplify a certain disposition to the work, a way of thinking that frames how they make sense of and enact their responsibilities. It is how they understand and want to make changes in their schools of education that sets these deans apart. In this chapter, I try to make sense of their sensemaking, to capture how they reason through their role in a never-ending change process. I have identified what I call their reform-mindedness, an essential characteristic in the next generation of education deans.

While the contributors discuss many issues, they primarily offer partial accounts of what deans change (or try to change), how they promote change, and why they pursue certain changes in certain ways. The chapters are retrospective and reconstructed stories of memorable segments of their experiences with change efforts. They dwell on the biographical—what has happened at their schools of education—and struggle with the autobiographical—how their lives interact with the changes they otherwise represent and promote. Their discomfort with self-portraits stems from a belief that changes are more about connections and joint efforts and less about any heroic acts on their part. At times, the nuances, edges, and layers of their intent are implicit or missing altogether. Some incidents appear too sensitive to tell, too entangled to unravel, or too fragile to expose. Yet they take us close enough to appreciate their quandaries, to perceive their mistakes, misinterpretations, or misjudgments, to note the complexities of their choices, and to recognize the many locations and countenances of their reform acts. It is from these glimpses into their reform-mindedness that I build the line of argument represented in this chapter.

What follows is my thinking about their thinking, a portrayal I develop from numerous experiences. For over 3 years, I was a member of the dean's strand of UNITE. We met 3-4 times each year for extended discussions about leadership and change in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs). I visited three of the authors on their campuses and, in one case, observed one dean's activities during a one-week period. During the revisions and subsequent drafts of the chapters, I spoke at length with the authors about the nature of their change practices. Added to these UNITE connections, I worked for 5 years (1991-96) as an associate dean with one of the authors, Michael Fullan, a period when we were deeply engaged in program, structural, and cultural changes at the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto. The notion of reform-mindedness, then, has its origins in many sources. I have translated, combined, and elaborated on these sources to develop a profile of how reform-minded deans understand their acts of change. While I refer to the deans in this volume (noted in parentheses) to illustrate particular perspectives and practices, my primary purpose is to define and argue for reform-mindedness as a necessary state of mind for tomorrow's deans of education, a position that ultimately includes but goes beyond what any of the deans in UNITE proposes.

Reform-mindedness

Fullan (1991, pp. 5,9,46,93) makes both a distinction and a connection between a theory of change—the content and causes of change—and a theory of changing—how to influence the causes and to engage in the process of change:

> So far I have dwelt on the problem of meaning in relation to the content of innovations. I have suggested that individuals and groups working together have to become clear about new educational practices that they wish (and/or someone else wishes them) to implement. This is meaning, if you will, about the content and theory of educational practice. Affecting the likelihood of obtaining meaning about the desirability and workability of specific educational practices is the question of *how* new practices are introduced. The latter concerns the theory of change—a complex social process in which people have just as many problems understanding what is happening and why. Educational change involves two main aspects: what changes to implement (theories of education) and how to implement them (theories of change). There are dangers in separating these two aspects, because they interact and shape each other. But

it is helpful to realize this distinction in planning or analyzing specific reform efforts. In short, we have to understand *both* the change and the change process.

In their stories of change, the deans elaborate and integrate these two realms of theory. Their theories of change include both what should change and the contextual factors that interact with and frequently frame the changes initiated. Their theories of changing encompass how changes develop (e.g., through phases or stages; in chaotic and unpredictable bursts) and which strategies and forces best enable, stimulate, and guide the change process. As if heeding the advice of Fullan above, these elaborations rarely appear apart from one another. Instead they represent their content (theory) of change as integral to their approaches to bringing about change (theories of changing). They construe their place in this integrated world of reform in relation to what they need to do, where they need to locate themselves, and which issues they need to confront.

Reform-minded deans recognize those interrelated areas where their initiatives will likely have the greatest influence on the nature and experience of change, what I refer to here as their five *zones of practice*. Within these zones, they determine which approach to try *(strategic action)*, which roles to play *(sociopolitical stance)*, and which key tensions they must address to enhance the impact of their practices *(orientation)*. Figure 1 (see next page) displays these three dimensions of the five zones of practice. Each zone of practice offers a different vantage point for understanding reform and certain parameters within which to affect change. Reform-minded deans appreciate the dynamic complexity of these zones and the need to learn how to work in and across their respective boundaries.

Zones of Practice

Focus on what and how school of education should change

At the heart of reform-mindedness are the changes deans have in mind, what they believe matters most, and what must be done as a result. Their image today of tomorrow's schools of education is an important reference point for present and anticipated change strategies. Much of what they do is based on their concept of a professional school and the quite different *place* they envision for schools of education.

Reform-minded deans have three notions of place which inform their concept of a professional school. First, they want schools of education to occupy a more prominent place (status) in the educational community,

FIGURE I—Reform Mindedness: Zones of Practice

Strategic Action *Deans adopt and adapt approaches which...*	**Sociopolitical Stance** *Deans position themselves in such roles as...*	**Orientation** *Deans work within and through tensions between...*
Focus on what and how schools of education should change	Boundary spanner Inventor Conscience	Improving the quality of work and Altering the design and intent of what happens
Extend the formal and informal contexts for sustained dialogue, periodic debate, and shared decision-making	Protagonist Processor Gamekeeper	Building common agendas and Encouraging variations
Participate in the initiation, enactment, and evaluation of change	"Polysynchronist" Action Researcher Provocateur	Solving problems and Managing dilemmas
Develop a more inclusive and expanded professional community	Conductor Co-constructor Animateur Culturel	Rethinking scholarship and Reorienting programs and Re-emphasizing service
Collaborate with those who influence and determine the parameters and direction of change	Translator Negotiator Activist	Reinvigorating the school of education and Reinventing the university

especially in terms of their stature on campus and their relationship with especially K-12 schools. Second, they aspire to a place (location) closer to the action of the wider platforms of education reform. They believe schools of education should pursue innovations prior to or alongside of changes elsewhere (e.g. elementary and secondary education). Third, they desire a place (culture) where faculty work more closely, more intensively, and more often with a wider range of colleagues on programs, studies, and projects which are at the forefront of reform. The deans in this volume have distinct yet compatible ways to conceptualize this *place-making* venture—reculturing (Fullan), building an ethos (Wisniewski), creating community (Huffman-Joley), stimulating professionalization (Zimpher), or simply "making K-12 schools and schools of education more effective and more satisfying places for students to learn and for faculty to teach" (Arends). They envision a place quite different from those in which they spent the early years of their careers, where faculty members devote significant periods of time:

- continuously improving their individual and collective capacity to teach, research, and lead within the education community;
- engaging with various combinations of colleagues in house and across campus to coordinate and extend local and regional programs;
- working with beginning and experienced educators in K-12 schools to experiment with, study, critique, and invent more effective and equitable practices;
- interacting (electronically and in person) with colleagues in national and international networks to compare and enrich what they know and are able to do;
- creating bridges between reforms across populations and contexts; and
- improving their initiatives to affect the conditions which shape the social and educational possibilities of individuals and groups in local and global settings.

Their anticipated place is a world in which everyone recognizes that their capacity to serve others is inextricably linked to a commitment to their own development; that the bounds of their success depends on their ability to foster and support an interdependent community; and that their relevance stems from a more situated, varied, and intense form of

work. Such is the image these deans have of what schools of education should become.

As Figure 1 suggests, reform-minded deans assume the stance of inventors who want to break with the past and create new possibilities. This sometimes requires rethinking the parameters within which schools, colleges, and departments of education have always worked (boundary spanner). They also must weigh the alternatives and wonder about the consequences of the different and the new. They worry about the intentions and direction of unknown paths (conscience). In these roles, deans find themselves pulled by two forces, one that strives to improve on the efficiency and effectiveness of *what is* (improving the quality of work) and the other that wants to transform the goals, structures, and roles to build *what ought to be* (altering the design and intent of what happens). This tension between first-order and second-order change (Cuban, 1988) ensures that the path towards a new order is a journey through numerous patches of conflicts, uncertainties, and dilemmas.

Disagreements in schools of education develop over if, to what degree, and with what level of intensity change should occur. Some faculty members are comfortable with the norms they have helped to create. Why tinker with, much less transform, something that does not need to change. Armed with the slogan, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," these resisters see change as an indictment of their good work. They consequently resent the implications of reform-mindedness and push back against any proposed change especially if it comes from deans (Yarger).

Others support improvements but only through building on the familiar. The desire is to develop a better version of what is usually through overcoming the obstacles to success by adding more of whatever is in short supply (e.g., "If we only had more...time, staff, resources, programs, technical assistance"). Caught in various cycles of working harder or smarter, those who concentrate on this level of change rarely distinguish between doing things better and doing things differently (and better). They are confused by and opposed to calls for bold leaps forward when they only see a need for refinement and enrichment.

Still others ignore the urges for more fundamental reform because they are already *with the program*. They point to their participation in such initiatives as professional development schools, interprofessional seminars, or standards-based program revisions as proof of their dedication to second-order changes. Yet the early stages of these innovative steps can have the look and sound of a new era but in practice involve relatively modest additions, rearrangements, or adaptations. The debate here

revolves around the extent to which their efforts genuinely reconceptualize and redirect existing program or the likelihood that incremental moves early in the process will lead to bold changes later.

Conflict then appears in more guises than simply dissent or opposition. It can also appear as: (a) support for reform but not to the degree represented by calls for a transformed workplace; (b) agreement in principle, language, and deed with new directions yet without the intensity to get beyond and beneath the surface to deeper changes; and (c) one-step-at-a-time responses which do not always make good on a natural progression to radically different practices. Each form of conflict presents a particular struggle which reform-minded deans must acknowledge and work through to determine the order of change most are prepared to pursue.

Even with some consensus about the need for second-order change, reform-minded deans still set out on a voyage along a route and for a destination perhaps beyond the vision of others on board. They head in a preferred direction with a conception of where they are going and how they will get there. They operate on a conviction that the destination will likely be reconstructed as the trek unfolds. By revisiting where they are going, how they are getting there, and how they can improve on both, deans engage their faculties in reducing the uncertainty and defining the dimensions of often broadly stated intentions of what they want their schools of education to become.

Reform-mindedness for these deans is not only about conscious efforts to achieve a new order by confronting conflicts and uncertainties but also about deliberate acts of good conscience. In most cases, business as usual is no longer tenable; change is long overdue and even urgent with the survival of schools of education hanging in the balance (Wisniewski). Dilemmas nevertheless abound. Is the direction right? Do those in schools of education have the skill and savvy to work with colleagues on campus and in the field? By enhancing their connectedness, do schools of education enrich or ensnare their prominence (Zimpher)? In a reinvented and partnered future, are schools of education more or less likely to become lead scholars, lead professional educators, or lead policy makers? The cutting edge is a precarious perch, one that even sure-footed deans traverse with caution forever evaluating the implications of the many reform-minded paths before them.

In this zone of practice, reform-minded deans keep where SCDEs should be going as a beacon and benchmark to what is changed, how, and why. They make the order of change problematic and linked to the struggle of getting to there from here, where *here* may not be fully known and *there* is in an ongoing state of becoming. In their search for new

boundaries, they situate themselves at the intersection of conflicts, uncertainties, and dilemmas that arise in the process of constructing what new schools of education should be like. Here they wrestle with decisions which compare and combine what is right, what has priority, and what is feasible.

Extend the formal and informal contexts for sustained dialogue, periodic debate, and shared decision-making

Any discussion about how schools of education should transform themselves presumes norms of discourse which may not consistently prevail. Many of the deans create opportunities for colleagues to 'learn to talk to one another' (Arends), sometimes for the first time, often for longer than previously experienced, and usually about topics relevant to changes in their practices. Faculties often have to develop interactive habits that require considerably more depth and scope than the social and procedural talk typical of many incidental, departmental, or committee exchanges. Whether in the halls, in the boardroom, or in special forums, the talk is turned to both immediate and anticipated changes. Altering the patterns of talk is both a vehicle for and a signpost of reform.

Reform-minded deans expand the reasons for faculty members to get together and the channels through which their talk can be expressed and heard. Formally this can occur through: (a) new units or departmental reorganization (Wisniewski, Zimpher), (b) program teams (Fullan), (c) school-university partnerships (especially professional development schools-Huffman-Joley, Nystrand), (d) reorienting the locus and distribution of control (governance—Arends, Wisniewski), (e) intensifying the conversation about change through town meetings (Zimpher) and retreats (Arends, Fullan), and (f) restructuring committees or task forces (Arends, Fullan, Huffman-Joley). Less formally this can emerge through (a) study groups, (b) participation in local, regional, national, and international networks (Fullan, Huffman-Joley), (c) occasions to celebrate, swap ideas, or troubleshoot around enduring problems (Yarger, Zimpher), (d) collaborative faculty development projects (Fullan), or (e) strategic interventions from outside consultants and "critical friends" (Arends, Huffman-Joley). The mutual influence of talk in both formal and informal settings is part of the relational and socially constructed foundation of reform.

The talk of deans depends on the roles they create for themselves in the sociopolitical landscape. Whether they have to lead the talk (protagonist), set up the frameworks within which talk can progress (processor), or mediate between competing interests or balance autonomous claims

(gamekeeper), reform-minded deans try to stimulate more effective working relationships and where possible, support the habit of shared endeavors. Weil (1994, p.164) captures this perspective in terms of the web of stories that constitute the narrative of change:

> Changing the story of an institution always involves changes for other people. Every player in an institution is both storyteller and audience, both spectator and spect-actor, engaged in different acts of communion and agency. But how these come together to create a greater whole that is vibrant, has purpose and is effective on the many fronts now demanded of colleges and universities is the biggest challenge facing those at the top of colleges and universities.
>
> Changes that are convincing can only be made jointly with others. A leader who works well with story—although he or she may not define it as such—knows the value of moving beyond mere explanation. She or he listens for patterns and clues that can guide the design and management of developmental processes. The telling of the stories that inspire is encouraged. The value of involving as many people as possible in making sense of external pressures and constraints, and determining and enacting future options will be expressed in many forms.
>
> Those at the top need to remain accessible to the stories that are important signals of things that are potentially damaging but unintended. The orchestration of constructive and creative engagements to support these processes can then give rise to the development of appropriate and fluid structures that can be shaped as the institutional story evolves...The connective tissue of relationships and new ways of working, that bring both communion and agency together, can be simultaneously nurtured.

These stories can collide when the familiarity of talk exposes differences that are difficult for some to reconcile into a common agenda.

Intensifying the talk in schools of education increases the understanding faculty members have about each other's similarities and differences. Though inclined to highlight those aspects many share, reform-minded deans also acknowledge the value of diversity where dissenting views are often the source of innovative breakthroughs in practice. As participant observers in the talk, deans are constantly assessing the cohering and divisive elements in conversations. When points of view start to come together, they may have to note the varied in what's common. When perspectives split, they may have to comment on the common in what's

varied. The challenge is to engage the faculty in the kind of talk that moves them towards collaborative work without suppressing different orientations. The goal is discovering how to embed the differences in a direction all can collectively endorse.

In this zone of practice, reform-minded deans look for how the frequency, intensity, and importance of talk can increase. They recognize that new ideas need some social currency and relational value. Changes require collective meaning among those charged with taking innovation forward. Sometimes in the background, sometimes as hosts, and sometimes as conduits, deans stay in touch with the talk. On occasion, they intervene if dissension threatens to separate and isolate colleagues or if the nature of the talk diverges from the struggle to incorporate and elaborate the insights of everyone involved. For most to *walk the talk*, the walkway has to be wide enough for colleagues to stroll, jog, or run together at a pace that still permits ongoing talk about the walk and some options for taking different routes if the itinerary needs to change.

Participate in the initiation, enactment, and evaluation of change

Some of the talk of reform-minded deans occurs within the actions and interactions of the many changes in which they have some investment and part to play. Whether they initiate an innovation, support the proposals of a motivated few, or join the projects of others, deans situate themselves in the midst of strategically significant reforms. Though not always welcome—"deans don't change programs, only faculty do that" (Yarger)—they get close to the changes and engage in the micropolitics that pervade the process. They need to feel the pulse of change, experience the daily dynamics of conflict and cooperation, and puzzle through where to best locate themselves as the dilemmas and turning points emerge.

Mindful of both the bounds and privileges of their office, deans take advantage of those rights of position which give them access to certain levers of change. They insinuate themselves closer to the action through more subtle or indirect strategies when the norms and structures do not necessarily provide them with an obvious option to participate. Many deans are unequivocal about where they want to go, state their priorities coming in, and persist in their advocacy for these directions throughout their tenure (Wisniewski, Zimpher). Some join the committed or the converted faculty in the anticipation that others will get caught up in the swirl created by their more reform-minded colleagues (Arends, Fullan). When an initiative is particularly important to the desired direction of reform, some deans take up a prominent role in the early stages to bolster

its chances of success (Fullan—cochair of restructuring committee, Nystrand—co-director of center). Others seek to broaden the leadership base by working with faculty members on breakthrough projects or using team approaches to managing reforms (Fullan, Huffman-Joley, Zimpher). Most deans invent ways to check out, check up on, or check in to new endeavors to determine when they need to take a stand or remain silent (Wisniewski) and when to challenge assumptions, name a problem, or work the halls (Yarger). The pressure and the support for change come from participating like a colleague, talking like a dean, and working at the elbows of those who are confronting the challenges inherent in a new direction.

Living in the midst of multiple innovations, reform-minded deans rarely stay in one spot for very long. They are constantly juggling demands, roles, and responsibilities ("polysynchronist"). Using the metaphor of theater, at various moments, deans can assume one of the lead roles; shift to the supporting cast or chorus; move backstage as producer, director, props and set manager, sound and lighting technician, or prompter; or take up the pen as writer in a play with a script perpetually in need of revision. With each relocation, they examine the state of change, determine the extent to which things have moved forward, develop a plan for what to do next, and try out various actions on their own or in concert with others (action researcher). In this complex role shifting, numerous problems arise.

If one of the basic lessons of dynamic change is that problems are our friends (Fullan, 1993, pp. 25-27), then reform-minded deans have a lot of *friends*. Fullan goes on to explain:

> It seems perverse to say that problems are our friends, but we cannot develop effective responses to complex situations unless we actively seek and confront the real problems which are in fact difficult to solve. Problems are our friends because it is only through immersing ourselves in problems that we can come up with creative solutions. Problems are the route to deeper change and deeper satisfaction. In this sense, effective organizations "embrace problems" rather than avoid them.
>
> Too often change-related problems are ignored, denied, or treated as an occasion for blame and defense. Success in school change efforts is much more likely when problems are treated as natural, expected phenomena, and are looked for. Only by tracking problems can we understand what has to be done next in order to get what we want.

> Problems need to be taken seriously, not attributed to "resistance" or the ignorance or wrong-headedness of others. Successful change management requires problem-finding techniques like "worry lists," and regular review of problem-solving decisions at subsequent meetings to see what happened. Since circumstances and context are constantly changing, sometimes in surprising ways, an embedded spirit of constant inquiry is essential.

Rather than seeing all problems as inevitable and regrettable obstacles which require immediate executive action to eliminate, deans recognize that some problems raise dilemmas which should be kept alive, contested, and probed. Dilemmas explore choices among often equally compelling options. Even when temporarily resolved, they linger in the shadows only to surface again as circumstances change. It is sometimes left to deans to return to these dilemmas, to stimulate repeated confrontations with their inherent tensions, and as a result to explore in greater depth those issues that most affect the course of reform (provocateur).

Reform-minded deans not only practice what they espouse but also discover what to espouse through their practice. In this zone of practice, deans position themselves so they can: learn firsthand about the intricacies and bumps of change; provide timely and strategic assistance to those who embrace and lead the reform agenda; exemplify and elaborate the kind of work needed for and implied by the new direction; and solve problems where feasible or more often engage everyone in confronting the fundamental dilemmas surfaced by the changes sought. In this kaleidoscopic world, their multiple roles blend and re-form as the context and forces of change alter.

Develop a more inclusive & expanded professional community

To some extent, this zone of practice interrelates with the efforts of deans to enhance and redirect the nature of talk in schools, colleges, and departments of education, as discussed above. Arends states: "It is through continuous dialogue and shared problem solving that we come to share the realities of each other's worlds so mutual plans can be developed in the support of improvement and renewal." The intent here is to build on the relational value of talk to create a professional community where everyone is included (and wants to be included) in the process of change.

For the most part, developing a more inclusive and expanded professional community is about reaching out and working with a wider range of educators beyond the walls of schools of education. Specifically, deans encourage more collaborative relationships often based in school-univer-

sity partnerships, support a greater presence in the field, and argue for more service and policy-oriented dimensions in programs and research. Reform-minded deans understand that the intellectual rigor, coherence, and practical relevance of what schools of education do are very much dependent on their capacity to become a valued partner with the many stakeholders in reform.

Much of this renewed spirit of connectedness happens through links made by schools of education with other constituencies in the educational community. Affiliations with K-12 schools in school improvement projects (Huffman-Joley), professional development schools (Nystrand, Zimpher), or a learning consortium (Fullan) provide a structural basis for redesigning preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Other associations through networks (e.g., UNITE) or partnerships (Zimpher—new Holmes Partnership) bring together schools of education and other influential organizations (e.g., school districts, teacher unions) around common issues and a desire to build a more unified profession. In some instances, alliances across disciplines and professions are forged to respond to urgent problems of community development and policy reform (Zimpher). Previously taken-for-granted boundaries between institutions are now part of a reconstructed and shared landscape. Deans continue to widen and refocus the lens through which they view the nature of what schools of education should do, with whom, and for what purpose.

For schools of education, building communities involves considerably more than strengthening ties within. They are remaking their culture by redefining the concepts of fellow worker (e.g., including colleagues in K-12 schools), place of work (e.g., also in schools, clinics and the community), and work itself (e.g., with a greater emphasis on serving clients). Often deans are out in front in this process in various roles orchestrating the evolving relationships across borders (conductor), comparing and combining multiple perspectives (co-constructor), and articulating, endorsing, and exemplifying the more interdependent norms of their culture in the making (*animateur culturel*).[1] In the transition, however, tensions surface about the work that schools of education should value and reward.

As Yarger notes, for some time universities have defined their work in terms of the "three-legged stool"—research, teaching, and service—with

[1] I first came across this phrase as part of a policy which recommends the appointment of an *animateur culturel* in Franco-Ontario schools. The *animateur culturel* is an advocate who promotes the preservation and development of Franco-Ontario culture in the school and community. When applied to deans of education, I am highlighting a role where they are an integral force in changing the culture of schools of education.

the research leg often "much thicker and longer than the others." The *stool* is changing. A more comprehensive notion of scholarship gives comparable status to research that generates, integrates, or applies knowledge. Teaching involves more than course-related proficiencies. Faculty also have to demonstrate their capacity to implement coherent programs, to work on interdisciplinary and interprofessional teams, and to adapt their pedagogical practices to the conditions of various field settings. Service is less an ambiguous and a modest addendum to tenure, promotion, and merit policies and more an explicit and equally important expectation of the job. Furthermore, more and more initiatives have become occasions for interrelating research, teaching, and service to inform and guide changes in policy and practice. Yet the old *lopsided* stool still pushes back and traditions persist. Nonetheless, with each new hire, with renewed attention to faculty development, and with more calls to restructure the reward system, faculty members reconsider these matters and move that much closer to a new, more balanced, and redesigned stool.

Reform-minded deans in this zone of practice realize that the way forward is to develop a more prominent and connected role for schools of education in educational change. As part of a more inclusive and expanded professional community, they have a greater chance and obligation to influence and be influenced by their partners, and, as a consequence, create a more collaborative and empowered place for schools, colleges, and departments of education in the process. The promise and the risks are high as old ways of work are dismantled and new patterns wrestle for advantage. Deans help to create the scaffolding for this culture-making venture, sometimes as protectors of the past, sometimes as community brokers, and sometimes as architects of the future.

Collaborate with those who influence and determine the parameters and direction of change

This last zone of practice is about the "connective power" of deans (Zimpher). In the course of furthering the change agenda, reform-minded deans situate themselves among university, regional, state, and national policymakers on numerous committees, boards, councils, or networks. Located in the midst and at the intersections of forums that shape and make decisions about what schools of education can do, deans engage in one or more of the following practices:

- Represent the collective voice of their faculty members on the matters at hand;
- Clarify the intent and structure of new directions;

- Deliberate about and help to define policies;
- Provide advance notice to colleagues and leaders likely interested in and affected by the changes; and
- Convey the perspectives of members of these forums to those in schools of education and in their partner institutions.

They place themselves in a position of strategic influence in their own establishments and with the organizations in the forums they serve.

Reform-minded deans look for ways to translate the deliberations of these forums into an advantage for their schools of education. On campus they accept additional leadership responsibilities (Nystrand, Zimpher) and use changes in university priorities as leverage for reforms in schools of education (Arends, Huffman-Joley). Locally, they "find ways to say yes" (Nystrand) and to support (Fullan) school and community partners who in turn lend their resources, ideas, and political assistance to ventures of mutual benefit. At the state and national levels, they assume prominent roles in such organizations as a professional standards board (Huffman-Joley), the Holmes Partnership (Zimpher), and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Arends, Wisniewski). As deans intensify these linkages, they create a web of associations which can directly and indirectly affect decisions relevant to the reforms of schools of education.

Deans carry the reputational value of their schools of education into various forums, and through their successful performance in these contexts, add to the record of distinction of their schools and universities. Their sociopolitical intentions go beyond the call of institutional duty and public profile. During the discourse around particular changes, they have a chance to explain their schools of education to other organizations represented around the table and in turn, to interpret the interests of these organizations for their colleagues (translator). They can also argue for particular directions, and if convincing, use the decisions to press and support the case for reform (negotiator). Over time, they develop a certain savvy about the dynamics of these forums, and can better determine when, how, and with whom to initiate proposals consistent with how their schools of education want to change (activist). To the extent that deans gain seats at the most influential tables, they have a vantage point from which to "capitalize on the inevitable" (Nystrand) and be part of the process that defines what the inevitable should be.

In this more public role in reform, deans feel responsible for representing both their schools of education and their universities. Yet in their

desire to enact this two-tiered responsibility, they become embroiled in the wider challenges confronting higher education and the responses of their universities to these challenges. In the opening chapter, Howey discusses these challenges in some detail. The major criticisms most often confronted by deans include the following:

- More time is devoted to teaching graduate than undergraduate students.
- The graduating students are not prepared to become fully functioning and successful members in the economic, social, and political life of their chosen communities.
- Scholarly research receives more attention than community service.
- Even when research is more closely tied to and embedded in the field, it is not necessarily relevant or significant to the most immediate and enduring problems of the community.

Increasingly deans are asked to devote their time to developing campus-wide responses to this public scrutiny.

Provosts (and presidents) are more and more inclined to call on deans to redefine and subsume the work of their units in the changes initiated by their respective universities. Efforts to restructure the universities (e.g., downsize operations, combine units and responsibilities), to be more selective about which programs to emphasize (e.g., rigorous review procedures), to support instructional development (e.g., faculty development centers), and to reach out to the wider community (e.g., distance learning, partnerships with local business and social agencies) frequently rely on deans to conceptualize and implement these institutional improvements. Many reform-minded deans endorse these changes and a university-centered definition of their role. The more service-oriented agenda, the importance of exemplary teaching, and the interest in interdisciplinary and interprofessional work fit into what schools of education are doing and should do even more. While it is tempting to see these trends as opportunities for schools of education to provide some leadership, deans recognize the complexities of these chaotic times and are cautious about how far to proceed without a net.

Despite their inclination to take risks, a number of forces make it difficult for deans to assume a university-centred role on campus or in their representative activities in the wider educational community. Most faculty members want their deans to advocate on their behalf and

subsume the preferences of the university in the priorities of their schools of education. Some initiatives clash with longstanding traditions about academic work. The movement towards more interdisciplinary and interprofessional work for example, may lead to a re-examination of the nature of knowledge and of the organizational structures necessary to support the development of this reconstructed image of knowledge—an unwelcome and too radical a shift for some. As deans look for guidance and support from university administrators, they sometimes discover that the rhetoric far exceeds the realities of reform and that the consensus about the new directions is fragile (e.g. the views of the provost may not necessarily be those of the president). Under these conditions, reform-minded deans stay school-centered but connect and represent the changes within schools of education as part of the new mission of universities.

In this zone of practice, deans strive for some advantage for their reforms. They gain access to a wider sphere of influence through collaborating in the decisions that ultimately frame what schools of education are able to do. At the table of local, regional, and national forums, they face both ways representing their faculty, schools, and universities to key stakeholders and representing these same stakeholders to colleagues back on campus. They use their awareness of and participation in defining new directions to keep their schools of education at the center of reform. While they often are at these forums on behalf of their universities, reform-minded deans concentrate their collaborative acts on changes which enhance the 'connective power' between schools of education and the universities in which they live. For reform-minded deans, reinvigorating schools of education informs and is informed by reinventing universities.

Within and Across Zones of Practice

While reform-minded deans vary in the zones of practice they most emphasize and in the strategic actions, sociopolitical stances, and orientations they most prefer, they do have a common understanding of how the zones individually and collectively stimulate change. They recognize the value of interrelating the three dimensions within each zone of practice and of addressing every zone of practice to achieve a new order of reform.

For a zone of practice to yield the level of change desired, all three dimensions must be engaged. Consider the zone which extends the formal and informal contexts for sustained dialogue, periodic debate, and shared decision-making. To improve the quality of talk, reform-minded deans understand that more is involved than identifying the most appropriate strategic actions. A presumed right move can run into problems if deans are in the wrong place (sociopolitical stance) or fail to

take into account the core tension in the zone of practice (orientation). For example, deans may declare their support for collaborative research by allocating some discretionary funds to joint projects. Some faculty may agree with the strategic action but not with the control of the allocation in the hands of deans. For the strategy to work, deans have to quickly shift roles from protagonists to processors and set up a more inclusive mechanism for distributing the funds. Obstacles may still persist if conflicts arise over what constitutes collaborative research and which criteria matter most in determining the allocation. Here deans have to anticipate the tension between common and diverse pursuits and to orient the process so that those involved can deal with any issues that occur. Reform-minded deans appreciate the dynamic interplay of these dimensions and the influence of these interactions on the course of change.

A reform-minded disposition also compels deans to see the connections across the five zones of practice. One zone not only can implicate the other zones but also can combine forces to broaden and deepen the reform agenda. When deans integrate the dimensions of the first three zones of practice listed in Figure 1, they bring together initiatives which can significantly change the way schools, colleges, and departments of education work. Previously disparate efforts to restructure (e.g., reorganize units, make procedures more efficient) and reculture (e.g., instill norms of collaboration by creating program teams and cohorts of students) the place can now proceed along a more coordinated and synergistic path. An even greater catalyst for reform is possible when all five zones of practice are simultaneously considered.

A concentration of the first three zones of practice may very well result in primarily internal changes in schools, colleges, and departments of education. Adding the perspectives of the last two zones of practice also involves expanding whom schools of education include as workers (e.g., partners in K-12 schools) and identifying which forums they want to participate in and influence. The reasons for reform encompass reconceptualizing what matters (e.g., more diverse and embedded definition of scholarship) and redirecting the changes in schools of education to interact with the priorities of universities. When all five zones of practice come into play, the changes within become part of a wider context of and a more fundamental purpose for reform.

For reform-minded deans, change is a multidimensional, multifaceted (e.g., zones of practice), and dynamic phenomena. Restructuring and reculturing strategies are constructed and reconstructed within an ongoing dialogue about reconceptualizing and redirecting what schools of education should become. This is most likely to occur when the zones of

practice intersect.

Tomorrow's Deans of Education

In this period of re-examination in higher education, it is important to get it right in the next generation of appointments for deans of education. And to *get it right*, I argue that it is imperative to recruit applicants whose dispositions reflect the kind of reform-mindedness described in this chapter and illustrated by the deans who contributed chapters to this volume. Such prospective deans should be leaders with an *attitude*. They should be of a mind to:

- engage in, enable, and explore the possibilities of reform;
- seek out, work with, and promote other reformers in the wider educational community;
- inform, influence, and use the support those who also shape the reform agenda; and
- talk, wonder, and worry about what matters most in reform.

This attitude should manifest itself in the ways they construe and represent the dynamic complexity of the five zones of practice.

Reform-minded applicants should see their prospective posts in terms of the areas, dimensions, and connections among the five zones of practice. The areas highlighted in the zones include: (a) purpose and direction of reform; (b) social world of schools, colleges, and departments of education; (c) engagement in the many facets of change; (d) community development; and (e) political influence and negotiation. They should know where to locate themselves within each zone through practices which combine strategic purpose, sociopolitical role, and orientation to key tensions. While they understand the distinct nature and dimensions of each zone, they should also appreciate that the order of reform sought in most schools, colleges, and departments of education requires the interrelated forces of all five zones of practice. Here they should articulate the transformative intent in the structural and cultural changes that the zones of practice collectively represent and foster.

Finally, what distinguishes the reform-minded applicants from those whose minds sometimes turn to reform, is an almost imperceptible but nonetheless powerful passion for change. On behalf of schools, colleges, and departments of education and the deans who lead these institutions, they express a deep sense of urgency, struggle, and destiny. Something

132

profound needs to happen and now (urgency). The taken-for-granted must be questioned, the disagreements and conflicts confronted, and the impossibilities challenged and pursued (struggle). And the primary place for schools of education to be is the midst and at the intersections of education reform (destiny). These are the emotions of the reform-minded, a *reform-heartedness* to spark what their heads understand and their hands design. In the throes of such rapid changes in higher education, it is critical for schools of education to attract and hire reform-minded deans.

References

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 341-44.

Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change. Second edition.* New York and Toronto: Teachers College and OISE Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces. Probing the depths of educational reform.* London: Kogan Page.

Weil, S. (1994). *Introducing change from the top in universities and colleges. 10 personal accounts.* London: Kogan Page.

About the Authors

Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran is professor of education and vice president and dean of the College at Salem College (North Carolina).

Kenneth R. Howey is a professor in the Department of Teacher Education and director of the Urban Network to Improve Teacher Education (UNITE) at Ohio State University.

Michael Fullan is dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (Canada).

Richard Wisniewski is director of the Center for Educational Innovation at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville.

Nancy L. Zimpher is dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University.

Raphael O. Nystrand is dean of the School of Education at the University of Louisville (Kentucky).

Gail Huffman-Joley is a professor in the School of Education at Indiana State University.

Sam J. Yarger is dean of the School of Education at the University of Miami.

Richard Arends is dean of the School of Education and Professional Studies at Central Connecticut State University.

Dennis Thiessen is a professor in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies and the International Center for Educational Change at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
TEL: 202/293-2450
FAX: 202/457-8095
WWW: www.aacte.org

Contents

Foreword ..... Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran

The Context for Leadership and Reform in Schools & Colleges of Education ..... Kenneth R. Howey

Leadership for Change in Faculties of Education ..... Michael Fullan

The New Sisyphus: The Dean as Change Agent ..... Richard Wisniewski

Deaning in the Nineties: The Challenge of Restructuring a Professional College ..... Nancy L. Zimpher

New Values & New Programs ..... Raphael O. Nystrand

Reconstructing the Community of the School of Education ..... Gail Huffman-Joley

Addressing the Dean's Dilemma ..... Sam J. Yarger

Building Capacity for Change ..... Richard Arends

Deans of Education: Only the Reform-Minded Need Apply ..... Dennis Thiessen

BEST COPY AVAILABLE